

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Jacob Pressman, Temple Beth Am, Los Angeles, Calif., offered the following prayer:

O God in Heaven: Look down upon Thy world, so marvelously wrought at the dawn of time for man's delight—so torn and tormented now by ancient grudges and newborn fears.

Look at this land, so fertile and broad, and yet so far from domestic tranquillity and fraternal love.

Look at this historic Chamber, echoing with patriots' dreams from less complicated times, now charged with awesome choices bearing on lives, not here alone, but everywhere on this earth and beyond this earth; not for this day alone, but for generations still to come.

Look at Thy children assembled here to fulfill the sacred trust placed in their hands by hopeful citizens, while human frailty, great temptations, and bitter disappointments whittle down the idealism and zest of younger days.

Look within us all, created in Thine image, and tell us quietly if we have polished or tarnished that image.

Look at Thy world, and pity us, O Lord; and teach us what to say and what to do to rise above ourselves and the demands of today to take the long, historic view—to bring peace and tranquillity, love and justice, beauty and order into our lives—what to say and do this very day, so that when it ends each of us will be able to examine himself honestly, face Thee unashamed, and sleep the sleep of innocence that comes to those who, while imperfect, have listened for Thy voice, and done their very best. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## OPENING PRAYER DELIVERED BY RABBI JACOB PRESSMAN

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and privilege for me to announce that the opening prayer of today's session was delivered by my dear friend and constituent, Rabbi Jacob Pressman, of Temple Beth Am in Los Angeles.

Rabbi Pressman is truly a model of what is generally considered the ideal religious leader. His heartfelt concern for his fellow man is well evidenced through the excellence of his service not only to members of his congregation but to the community as a whole.

His leadership and devotion have justifiably earned him the respect, admiration, and affection of all who know him.

## JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Joint Economic Committee be granted an extension of time from March 1, 1963, to March 15, 1963, to file a report of its findings and recommendations with respect to the Economic Report of the President, as required by section 5(b)(3) of Public Law 304, 79th Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, in recent times this has been a kind of customary procedure, pretty much necessitated by the circumstances under which the joint committee operates?

Mr. BOLLING. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. HALLECK. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

## ILLINOIS EDITORS VISIT PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 14, 20 Illinois newspaper publishers and editors were luncheon guests of President Kennedy at the White House. One of these distinguished journalists was the Honorable Robert L. Kern, publisher of the News-Democrat, of Belleville, Ill., in my congressional district.

I am certain my colleagues in the House will enjoy Mr. Kern's observations made during his White House visit.

Accordingly, I include Mr. Kern's article which appeared in the News-Democrat Tuesday, February 19, 1963:

## LUNCHING WITH THE PRESIDENT

(By Robert L. Kern)

"About your visit with the President, write what you wish without reservation, but do not attribute any statement directly to him." In substantially these words, Presidential Press Secretary Pierre Salinger ticked off the ground rules for 20 Illinois newsmen who came to Washington at Pres-

ident John F. Kennedy's request, to be his guests at luncheon on Valentine's Day.

Like the rest, this journalist's invitation came in the form of a telegram a few days prior to February 14. It read: "It would be useful to me to have an exchange of views with you on State, regional, and National problems. Therefore I would be most pleased to have you as my guest at luncheon Thursday, February 14th at 1 p.m. (Enter the northwest gate on Pennsylvania Avenue). I hope it will be possible for you to attend. It would be appreciated if you would kindly reply to Press Secretary Pierre Salinger. (Signed) John F. Kennedy."

The reply goes out quick, short and affirmative.

## THROUGH THE GATE

So here you are in the Nation's Capital at a few minutes past noon on the 14th, approaching the small gatehouse on Pennsylvania Avenue where uniformed officers monitor all traffic to the front door of the White House.

The iron gate is closed, and since the day is overcast and chilly, the three guards are inside where it's more comfortable. You enter the cubicle and hand over the telegraphed invitation. An officer scans a type-written list posted on the wall, searching for your name. For a moment yours doesn't seem to be there, but a second guard peers toward the list and stabs his finger at the right place. Good—you're on the list.

With a courteous gesture you are waved ahead toward the curving sidewalk that terminates at the famous north portico about a quarter of a block away. This is the front porch where Presidents step out to greet certain visiting heads of state and personages of lofty prominence in world affairs.

The winter has been pretty rough in Washington and the White House lawn looks ravaged and dead, much like yours at home. There are a number of pigeons waddling about on the dried grass, looking too fat to fly. Several gray squirrels, too, and one pure white, like the breed found in the city park over in Olney. Contrasted with the pigeons they look miserably skinny. Wonder how come?

## WHERE YOU'LL SIT

A friendly butler meets you at the door with such an air of respectful consideration that you begin to feel important. You enter the great marble entrance hall where one attendant takes your coat and hat while another leads you across the room to a side table. Something resembling a game board reposes on the table. But this is not parcheesi. It is a diagram or plan of the table for today's luncheon and the seating arrangement will be determined here by the drawing of numbers from a silver bowl. Mr. Kennedy will occupy the center seat along one long side of the table. Mr. Salinger will be directly opposite him in the middle of the other long side. Disposition of the guests is left to chance.

You select a card from the bowl, and turn it over. No. 19. You will be facing the President from across the table, four chairs to Mr. Salinger's left. Not bad.

## WHAT YOU SEE

This formality concluded you are conducted into the Red Room. Here you learn that while you are an early bird, two others are earlier. The Red Room gets its name from the color of its silk damask walls. The shade is richly brilliant but not overpowering owing to the great number of huge paintings that adorn the walls. All are portraits of past presidents, and the full-length canvas of Thomas Jefferson over the marble mantel looks 10 feet high. The magnificent pieces of furniture are large, antique, and

perfectly maintained. The elegant patina on desk and tables speaks of a little wax and a lot of elbow grease. There are also two settees and several fine upholstered chairs, almost too beautiful to use.

An expanse of tall windows across the room reveals a vista of several acres of lawn, which you anticipate will be green in time for the traditional egg-rolling debacle at Easter. It is gray today.

#### SECLUDED SWING

Peering upward to your left you catch a view of the south porch where Harry Truman installed his mezzanine. He got the devil for that from some architectural purists who deplored his taste. Republicans, no doubt.

You stand high above the ground and until now you missed the tiny secluded patio nestled against the building directly beneath the window. Thick shrubbery affords an effective screen and there are several rather large trees, too. The day is not pleasant, and the place is unoccupied. You note an old-fashioned rope swing dangling from a high tree branch. It is a stout child's swing of the practical, old-fashioned kind, and you have an idea who swings there sometimes.

By the time you turn around guests have begun flocking in. They stand around in small groups engaging in small talk. Drinks are passed around on a silver tray: Bourbon, Scotch, cocktails, sherry, tomato juice.

Almost precisely at 1 o'clock the President enters the room confident and smiling. He moves from person to person shaking hands and exchanging greetings. He stands erect, handsome and fit in a medium gray business suit. He seems completely relaxed and at ease. Thank goodness that bad back is improving. Sore backs can be hell. Someone mentions a rocking chair and there is unanimous agreement that rocking chairs make bum backs feel better.

#### FAVORITE PORTRAIT

The President shows keen interest in the portraits on the walls. Some are historic gems. His first choice, it seems, is for a more recently acquired portrait of Woodrow Wilson painted in France while the World War I President was attending sessions of the Versailles Conferences.

After a short time the President moves toward the state dining room, and the double doors swing open. The large room is as sumptuous as a Hollywood set, but in elegant good taste. A long table, perhaps 25 or more feet in length extends down the center of the room, its mahogany top gleaming. It seems 6 or 7 feet wide with both ends semicircular. As expected, the President takes his place at the center of the long side, facing the door, with his back to the immense marble fireplace.

The guests quickly settle into their high-backed gold-upholstered chairs without confusion. Gilt-edged placecards, with names of individuals hand engraved, are at each plate beside menus typed in script on embellished parchment bearing the Presidential seal.

Plates are the whitest of white porcelain, gold bordered, with small blue stars and the Presidential crest in the center. Knives, forks and spoons are in gold finish, of antique design, with the knife handles of gleaming mother-of-pearl.

#### TEMPTATION DEFIED

There are individual gold ashtrays at each place. What a souvenir. This fleeting thought, supplanted by the vision of No. 19 tearing down Pennsylvania Avenue with the Secret Service in hot pursuit, shatters the dream. You settle thankfully for a book of

matches, completely white, lettered simply in gold: "The President's House."

Six waiters start serving with the circumspect, swift efficiency gleaned through long service. They offer you a portion of Maryland surprise, which turns out to be individual pieces of fish dipped in batter and baked. This is followed by roast sirloin of beef (in thin slices), Yorkshire pudding (instead of bread), braised endives, puree of broccoli and a red Burgundy wine; Chateau neuf-du-Pape La Bernardine 1957. The windup consists of tarte aux poires normande, a light baked dessert, and coffee.

The cigar humidor is passed and you pluck a Corona Corona in what appears to be the 35-cent size. Flame will not sully yours. It will be another souvenir to go with the white matchbook.

But the more sophisticated newsmen light up, and so does the President. His cigar, however, is lighter in shade and smaller in size. Before the party breaks up he will have consumed two, rekindling each several times because of frequent neglect.

#### PRESIDENTIAL TALENTS

With removal of the last plate the President clears the deck and gets down to business. Questions from the visitors begin to flow on every subject in the news today touching on national and international crises. The President listens attentively, then replies in detail.

As he goes on you settle back to witness the most brilliant display of skillful fielding it probably ever will be your pleasure to see.

The President is wonderfully articulate, never groping for a word. His mastery over the art of lucid communication must be one of the better blessings of good Irish ancestry.

What astonishes you most is the fantastic store of pertinent facts and figures he is able to summon up instantly on every conceivable phase of Federal Government as it touches his job.

The Illinoisans often preface their questions with openers like "Folks in our area would like to know," or "people out in the Illinois wonder about." The questions themselves actually aren't so unusual as to be earthshaking. What the questioners try to do is open the blinds a bit to let in a little more light.

#### SPELLS OUT ANSWERS

Somebody asks about whether it makes sense to cut taxes while the country is going to sink deeper and deeper into debt. The President answers, showing his great concern for the Nation's overall economy. Can the Nation afford to pay farmers more to produce less? What's making General de Gaulle kick over the traces? What about the current political hubbub over Cuba? Is our position in Berlin better today than a year ago? Would you care to comment on rumors that Presidential brother-in-law Sargent Shriver is interested in running for Governor in Illinois?

Each question draws a frank informative reply. The questions are not new. They have been asked before. And they have been answered by the President or his spokesmen, and the replies have been faithfully and fully recorded in the press and over the airwaves.

But this time it is different, somehow. This time the answers come direct from the top, bearing an aura of authority they never had before. You sense that you are in the presence of a true leader—keen, strong, great.

It is 3 o'clock and time to leave. The President rises and reluctantly his guests follow suit. They have been having a ball. But their host has a televised press con-

ference scheduled in less than an hour—an appearance before the Nation during which he again must be at his best, replying to every conceivable query with sound logic, cold facts and good humor. What frightful responsibilities are these that must be borne by the leader of the world's greatest nation.

In some quarters it is a thankless unappreciated effort. Not everybody loves Jack Kennedy. You pray that Someone up there does. A President needs all that kind of help he can get.

#### SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on the 26th day of February 1963, the Honorable Frank G. Clement, Governor of the State of Tennessee, affixed his signature to Senate Joint Resolution No. 20, acts of 1963, of the Tennessee General Assembly, making Sir Winston Churchill, resident of London, England, an honorary citizen of the State of Tennessee, United States of America.

The resolution reads as follows:

A RESOLUTION OF THE STATE OF TENNESSEE  
To All to Whom These Presents Shall Come,  
Greeting:

I, Joe C. Carr, Secretary of State of the State of Tennessee, do hereby certify that the annexed is a true copy of Senate Joint Resolution 20, acts of 1963, the original of which is now on file, and a matter of record in this office.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my official signature and by order of the Governor affixed the Great Seal of the State of Tennessee at the Department in the city of Nashville, this 27th day of February A.D. 1963.

JOE C. CARR,  
Secretary of State.

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 20

Resolution to make Sir Winston Churchill an honorary citizen of Tennessee

Whereas a resolution has been introduced in the Congress of the United States to confer honorary citizenship upon Sir Winston Churchill, of England, subject to the legal requisite that he be first and also an honorary citizen of a State of the Union comprising the United States of America; and

The mother of Sir Winston having been a Virginian; and

His services while Prime Minister of Great Britain being of inestimable value not only to all English-speaking peoples but to the whole free world; and

Since never in its glorious history has England brought forth a son so well equipped by force of character and an unusual combination of powerful abilities to lead and direct his nation and assist its Allies in the gravest crisis that has as yet imperiled them; and

Whereas his voice and pen have left a legacy enhancing the literature of our mother tongue with passages that stir and lift the spirit as none other of his time, and with never-to-be-forgotten thoughts that



illumine like a beacon the dark turmoil of life; and

As multitudes throughout this country and along its farflung battlelines—in homes that had given husbands, fathers, sons to war, and in fields and foxholes, and on the ensanguined seas—have heard that memorable voice and fed upon his high-hearted courage, valor, sympathy; and

Since none more than he has contributed to that greatest of all victories, the sign of which he kept always before us in that night of time before the dawn; and

Since God has spared him still to remain among us into the 89th year of his immortal life: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the 83d General Assembly of the State of Tennessee (the House of Representatives concurring), That Sir Winston Churchill, resident of London, England, hereby be made an honorary citizen of the State of Tennessee, United States of America.*

Adopted February 19, 1963.

JAMES L. BOMAR,  
Speaker of the Senate.  
WILLIAM L. BARRY,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Approved, February 26, 1963.

FRANK G. CLEMENT,  
Governor.

Mr. Speaker, Tennessee is the first State to be recorded in the Journal of the House conferring honorary State citizenship on Sir Winston Churchill. We are all aware of this great man's service to not only his nation but to the cause of freedom, human dignity, and constitutional government throughout the world and I will not reiterate this history here.

In addition, Sir Winston, whose mother was a native Virginian, has close personal ties with our great United States of America.

For some time efforts have been underway to confer upon Sir Winston honorary citizenship of the United States of America. I am informed that the Department of Justice has found no legal reasons as to why this cannot be done, that Sir Winston would cherish and esteem such an act and that Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER of the House Judiciary Committee has introduced a new bill granting honorary citizenship to Sir Winston.

The State of Tennessee has given clear proof that our people support this act of high regard for Sir Winston and I therefore urge the support of my distinguished colleagues in making this great man an honorary citizen of the United States of America.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the program for next week.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, we have no legislative business, as I advised the House yesterday, for the balance of this week. The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar day.

Tuesday is undetermined—Baltimore primary.

Wednesday: House Resolution 228—A resolution to provide funds for investigations and studies, Banking and Currency Committee.

Thursday and the balance of the week: House Resolution 254—A resolution to provide funds for investigations and studies, Education and Labor Committee.

This, of course, is subject to the usual reservation that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise the House there are at least two important measures, and perhaps three, that may be reported from legislative committees. Of course, I do not want to anticipate the action of the committees or of the Committee on Rules, but I would like to advise that probably the week after next we will have at least three major proposals from three of the committees.

#### ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER ON CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### LET'S TAKE A GOOD LOOK

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the time is near when we shall consider the foreign aid authorization bill. It is no secret that this bill will raise more questions this year than it has raised in the past. Its reception will depend upon the character of its presentation by the executive branch. If there is a willingness to admit errors and to change faulty procedures and policies, the legislation may win reasonable support. On the other hand, if the executive branch attempts to gloss over the defects and treats the problem as if we were in 1948 instead of 1963 the program will be in serious trouble indeed.

President Kennedy, early this year, appointed a committee to review the foreign aid program and to make recom-

mendations. Gen. Lucius D. Clay was named chairman of the committee and the other members are distinguished gentlemen, indeed. This committee has the opportunity to save the good portions of the foreign aid program by recognizing its problems and treating them in a forthright manner.

Unfortunately, dispassionate review has not characterized Foreign Aid Study Committees in the past. As the distinguished political commentator, Peter Edson, points out this will be the fourth time in the last 10 years that the Government has gone through what he calls "this same aid reform exercise." He goes on to say:

U.S. and free world security was the theme of the Mutual Security Administration which administered foreign aid at the end of the Truman administration. This is what it will apparently be once again if the Clay idea prevails.

When the Eisenhower administration came to town, it recruited a lot of big business executives to survey foreign aid. The result was that MSA was changed into the more businesslike Foreign Operations Administration.

Then former President Herbert Hoover's Commission on Reorganization of Government surveyed foreign economic operations in 1955. FOA was changed to International Cooperation Administration. President Eisenhower then appointed another commission under Gen. William H. Draper to survey foreign aid again in 1959. It is reminiscent of the Clay committee.

If the committee merely goes through the motions of rubber stamping the aid program, it might as well have never been born. I have set forth my views in a letter which I wrote to General Clay on January 28, 1963, and I append this letter herewith.

JANUARY 28, 1963.

Gen. LUCIUS D. CLAY,  
Chairman of the Committee To Strengthen  
the Security of the Free World, Department  
of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL CLAY: I was interested to learn that President Kennedy had named a committee to review and make recommendations concerning our program of foreign assistance and that you had agreed to be Chairman of this committee.

As a Member of Congress serving on the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, I read of the formation of your committee with mixed feelings.

First of all, there is a history of independent committees in the past. In many cases, they have been appointed to support existing programs and have done so without substantial qualification or criticism.

Secondly, the atmosphere under which your committee was appointed led to the description in the Wall Street Journal of its formation as "a hurry-up move to disarm congressional opponents of foreign aid."

I am not an opponent of foreign aid, in fact I have always voted for foreign aid bills, but I have seen enough of the operation of these programs to know that their continuance will not be furthered by an uncritical approach. Their failures and shortcomings have gradually filtered into the public consciousness and the necessary popular support will not continue unless substantial steps are taken to assure the public that these programs are properly staffed and adequately administered.

Thirdly, since people who have had a responsibility in its past operation have been selected to do the vitally important preparatory work for the committee, one could conclude that yours might very well constitute an exercise in self-examination—which is self-defeating.

In the areas of self-help, of fiscal reform, of increased contributions by allies whom we have restored to viability, in the propping up of oppressive regimes and in the support of pro-Communist governments, there are questions which must be examined and properly settled if foreign aid is not to dwindle and expire.

The committee can perform a useful function if it causes our administrative agencies to recognize that problems do exist and that change is essential if public and congressional support is to be continued.

You have served our country in an outstanding manner in the past in war and in peace and you have a great opportunity to strengthen the necessary elements of our program of foreign assistance by a dispassionate and empirical examination by your committee.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. MONAGAN,  
Member of Congress.

General Clay responded to my letter on February 7, 1963, as follows:

COMMITTEE TO STRENGTHEN THE  
SECURITY OF THE FREE WORLD,  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, D.C., February 7, 1963.

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MONAGAN: I am most appreciative of your letter of January 28. I want to assure you that our committee has spent hours in cross-examination and is determined to form its own conclusions and recommendations.

From what I have seen and heard from its members, they are keenly aware of the need for a critical approach.

I shall call you when our work has progressed somewhat further to ask for the opportunity to let you know what we are thinking.

Sincerely yours,

LUCIUS D. CLAY.

For the sake of the valuable portions of the foreign aid program, I sincerely hope that General Clay's assurance that the committee members are aware of the need for a critical approach will be demonstrated by their actions.

Otherwise, the future of the foreign aid program is dubious, to say the least.

Let us take a good look.

#### SPECIAL ORDER FOR 2 HOURS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT TO DISCUSS RECORD OF COMMITTEE ON EDU- CATION AND LABOR IN 87TH CON- GRESS

MR. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MR. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, I have just received permission to address the House on a special order on next Wednesday for 2 hours. The purpose of

this request is to enable the majority members of the Committee on Education and Labor to present to the House what we believe to be the factual record of the Committee on Education and Labor in the 87th Congress and to answer certain allegations which have been made on the floor of the House concerning the record of that committee.

I would also like to say we will allot a good portion of the second hour of this special order to any Members of the minority who wish to discuss the matter with us at that time.

#### CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

MR. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

MR. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I am again today introducing a bill which would prohibit campaign contributions from crossing State lines—campaign contributions to influence elections for the National House, the U.S. Senate, the Presidency, and presidential electors.

Mr. Speaker, there is no reason under the sun for money to be poured from one State during political campaigns into another. Members of Congress are supposed to be the representatives of a particular State. The sovereign people of each State elect their own representatives to represent them. Under no circumstances should they be influenced by money gotten together in some smoke-filled hotel room in Chicago, Detroit, London, England, or even Caracas, Venezuela.

Pressure groups with tremendous campaign funds are on the march. They are determined to control the Congress. Much progress is being made in that direction with huge campaign treasuries.

This Congress must take some action to restore the confidence of the American people. The prestige of Congress is at an alltime low with nepotism, counterpart hayrides, and irresponsible shenanigans by some Members in the nightclubs of London and Paris. This is doing more damage to the cause of representative government in the United States than Communist subversion.

Campaigns for Federal office are largely campaigns of who can raise the most money. We hear reports of \$100,000 being spent in races for the House of Representatives, and \$1 million in Senate races. This makes a mockery of real democracy as much of this money often comes from pressure groups a thousand or more miles away and sometimes even abroad. If Federal public office is open to only the highest bidder, then indeed we have fallen upon evil days, and this Republic cannot long endure.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe it is too late. This Congress can and must take

positive action to restore the prestige of this great institution. The cause of freedom everywhere rides on the outcome of our own integrity, our prestige, and our principles and ideals.

#### RIDE HERD ON AWARD OF ALL NEGOTIATED CONTRACTS

MR. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

MR. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which will, if enacted, establish a joint congressional committee to ride herd on the award of all negotiated contracts. This committee will include Republican and Democrat members from the Appropriations, Armed Services, Government Operations, and Space Committees of both the House and Senate and will be 100 percent bipartisan in nature; compel complete public disclosure of the reason for awarding a negotiated contract, except where such information is classified; require that a public record be kept of all persons other than the bidder who have communications with the Government about negotiated contracts. This would include Members of Congress and the executive branch.

Some of my proposals may sound revolutionary, but the awesome size of our budget makes unusual steps necessary. The current budget calls for spending over \$60 billion for space and defense and 80 percent of all defense contracts are negotiated or sole source without open competition. The Secretary of Defense is on record as stating we must continuously seek to minimize sole source procurements.

I think it is time the Congress took hold of the reins of all this spending and helped the Secretary achieve his goal. This is what I have been doing for 18 months in a lengthy study, and this is what my legislation is designed to do.

#### GOP NUCLEAR TEST PANEL RE- LEASES SECOND REPORT

MR. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a report.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MR. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the Republican House conference committee on nuclear testing has prepared a summary of arguments pro and con regarding the wisdom of entering into any test ban agreement with the Soviet Union at this time. Assistance in preparing the compilation was obtained from such diverse organizations as the American Security Council and the Committee on Sane Nuclear Policy. Most of the arguments



pro and con listed in the report were contained in nine "expert's papers" submitted to the committee during the past 3 weeks by nationally known scientific and geopolitical experts.

The committee objective in its second report is to provide a fair statement of the issues as a guide for widespread and informed public discussion of the question of nuclear test bans in general. In its first report, the committee called on all Members of Congress to assume responsibility for encouraging such a public discussion, declaring "vital questions of U.S. national security are involved and Americans have a right to make their voices heard." It also called upon the Kennedy administration to declassify and disseminate seismic detection and other data pertinent to overall examination of the test ban issue.

The nuclear testing committee will continue to examine evidence before it and issue reports from time to time on the progress of the Geneva test ban negotiations.

These reports will be fair, but the constant retreats and concessions by Disarmament Administration Chief William C. Foster at the negotiating table must be expected to become the subject of the committee's very critical comment.

The second report is as follows:

#### SECOND REPORT TO THE REPUBLICAN CONFERENCE BY ITS COMMITTEE ON NUCLEAR TESTING

In its first report your committee described the prime U.S. objective of national survival as in direct conflict with communism's goal of worldwide domination. We expressed the valued judgment that a superior U.S. nuclear weapons arsenal capable of instant and deadly retaliation is required to deter the Communists from initiating nuclear war to gain their objective quickly.

From this background the first report began examining whether the proposition of a nuclear test ban treaty could reduce the world's risks inherent in present conditions without creating new or different risks which would leave matters in a state worse than before.

Because Communists cannot be trusted to keep their treaty commitments the first report specified certain minimum safeguards which must be contained in any nuclear test ban treaty. These are: (1) reasonable machinery to detect possible violations; (2) reasonable opportunity to inspect to determine if cheating has occurred; and, (3) consequences not fatal to the victim if either cheating or surprise abrogation occurs.

The basis of present test ban negotiation between the United States, U.S.S.R. and United Kingdom were examined by the first report, found wanting in these safeguards, and demand was made upon the administration to upgrade the U.S. negotiating position. So far, this has not been done. On the contrary, more concessions to Soviet demands have been announced.

Demand also was made for declassification and dissemination of all seismic and other data required for informed public discussion of the test ban question. The basis for this demand was that the security and future of the Nation is concerned and, therefore, the people have a right to be informed and make their voices heard.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has scheduled public hearings early in March at which administration officials will testify concerning seismic detection. Whether this will amount to "a quick peek

under the clean side of the rug" or forthright disclosures of limitations as well as capabilities in seismic detection remains to be seen.

On the general question of whether any test ban treaty at all at the present time is in the national interest, the first report recommended Members of Congress of both parties assume responsibility to encourage widespread public discussion. It so recommended because test ban negotiations have dragged on for 5 listless years during which the Soviets twice have gained substantial advantages by surprise resumption of testing.

If Americans decide a treaty is in the national interest, it will facilitate achieving one. If they decide otherwise, it will facilitate breaking off negotiations. Informed, widespread public discussion is required to reach a decision.

As a guide for leading public discussion your committee promised to Members of Congress a summary of the arguments for and against a test ban treaty. It is set forth below. In compiling these arguments, your committee gratefully acknowledges the assistance and cooperation of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Committee on Sane Nuclear Policy, the American Security Council, and the nine scientific and geopolitical experts who submitted expert's papers to your committee.

In evaluating test ban "pro" and "con" positions it must be kept in mind they pertain not to the inadequate and dangerous range of treaty terms now under negotiation, but to a hypothetical "enforceable" treaty—that is, one under terms of which cheating is less likely to occur than compliance. If such a treaty is achievable it must be assumed the Soviet Union agrees to it because it finds it in its own national interest to do so. The reasonableness of such an assumption is not here examined. But respecting it, two relevant questions should be in mind while evaluating the "pro" and "con" arguments: (1) In what respects do Soviet national interests in this subject differ from our own?; (2) under what circumstances, if at all, does Marxist-Leninist dogma permit Communist leaders voluntarily to forgo a means of achieving worldwide domination?

The compilation of "pro" and "con" positions follow:

#### I

##### *Test ban treaty will slow the proliferation of nuclear weapons to other countries*

**Pro:** Eleven nations in addition to those already possessing nuclear weapons (United States, U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, and France) have the necessary economic base, industrial capacity, and skilled manpower to launch at least a primitive program for nuclear weapons "in the near future," according to a recent study by Christopher Hohenemser. Among them are China, East Germany, and West Germany. The spread of nuclear weapons to any additional nations multiplies the chances of accidental war, tends to undermine existing military strategies, and increases the number of parties that must be satisfied before workable arms control agreements can be reached. Nuclear testing is necessary before a nation can produce these weapons without outside assistance. While a test ban would not automatically prevent other nations from testing, the provision that additional governments should adhere to the agreement gives the original parties an opportunity to exert pressure at least on their own allies.

**Con:** The magnitude of present difficulties between the United States and France illustrates the naivete of any belief that one nation can handle another which is determined to achieve nuclear weapons. Red China amply has demonstrated its absolute

refusal to be handled by the U.S.S.R. Attempts by the United States to handle its European allies by exerting pressure on them could strain NATO to the breaking point. The only practical way to control the danger of accidental war is to prevent the proliferation of nuclear warhead delivery systems. If a nuclear power is forced to develop its own characteristic national delivery system, then a mischiefmaking attacker may be identified and the attacked nation need not respond on the assumption general war has been initiated. This discrimination cannot be made from the explosion of a warhead—it can be made very quickly from the characteristics of the delivery vehicle which carried it. Similar reasoning applies to matters of military strategies and achieving arms control agreements.

#### II

##### *Test ban treaty will slow down the development of nuclear weapons*

**Pro:** According to Disarmament Administrator William C. Foster: "Without a treaty and with continued unlimited testing on both sides, there would be further increases by both in the efficiency of weapons at the higher yield end of the scale. Our advantage in small-weight, high-yield weapons would most probably diminish. Both sides would enhance their knowledge of weapons effects. In the field of tactical weapons, the Soviets would eventually be able to match our more diversified and numerous arsenal. Overall, the trend would be toward equality between the United States and the U.S.S.R."

"With a treaty, improvements in yield-to-weight ratios would come more slowly through laboratory work alone. The U.S. advantage in smaller weapons would persist over a longer time. Some weapons effects phenomena would remain unsettled or undiscovered by both sides. The development of antimissile systems would be slowed down on both sides. Our tactical weapon superiority would persist longer. In general, our present nuclear advantages would last for a considerably longer period."

**Con:** There is no real assurance the United States has superiority in usable tactical weapons and Mr. Foster does not claim it for high-yield weapons. The Soviets have announced solution of the missile defense problem. Thus a test ban runs the risk of freezing U.S. technology in a position of inferiority. As the potential defender against an aggressor's first strike, U.S. national security can be based only on superiority in weaponry, particularly in anti-ICBM defense, which has not been achieved and can only be achieved by further coordinated development of both antimissile warheads and rockets to carry them.

If, as Mr. Foster argues, the United States presently has weapons superiority, then it exists because U.S. laboratories are able to win over U.S.S.R. laboratories in open competition. Mr. Foster's statement that under conditions of nontesting "our present nuclear advantages would last for a considerably longer period" implies that Soviet laboratories would move faster than our own under a test ban. Thus inevitably at some time the United States will become "second best." What happens then?

#### III

##### *Test ban treaty will "open up" Soviet society and establish an invaluable precedent*

**Pro:** A test ban which includes provision for some detection machinery and onsite inspection in the Soviet Union has potential significance for progress in other areas of arms control and disarmament and for future relations between the United States and the U.S.S.R. It would give both sides experience with inspection and permit us to appraise their cooperation, and, in the

light of that appraisal, to estimate the co-operation which might be forthcoming in the verification of more significant agreements. It might also serve to "open" the Soviet Union to some extent and to help diminish the Soviets' fear that effective control is another name for espionage. It could lead to the development of a basis for confidence in other agreements.

Con: It is idle to think that a small number of stations and inspections on Soviet soil will have any significant impact upon the structure or attitudes of Soviet society. Certainly what the U.S.S.R. now seems to have in mind is considerably less than the United States originally had envisaged—and too little to accomplish this purpose. What is more, if the United States, in the interest of pious hopes now accepts a diluted, token version of international inspection to save face as it enters upon a treaty, the precedent which it will set will not be at all valuable, but highly dangerous and prejudicial to free world security in the future. Further, freezing present seismic detection technology into treaty terms will kill off development of detection devices which could be the future basis of a treaty in which genuine confidence could be placed.

#### IV

##### *Test ban treaty will eliminate additional fallout*

Pro: A test ban treaty should lead to the elimination of whatever danger exists from fallout from United States and U.S.S.R. nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere.

Con: Only a treaty banning atmospheric testing is required to accomplish this end.

The United States stands ready to enter such a treaty, but the U.S.S.R. refuses—until it agrees, fallout from testing is the inevitable price for avoiding fallout from war.

#### V

##### *Test ban treaty will create international good feeling and promote arms control and disarmament*

Pro: In democratic countries, one of the main factors producing a sense of helplessness on the part of citizens has been the magnitude of the arms race. To people throughout the world who have passively observed the years of deadlock in disarmament negotiations a nuclear test ban agreement would restore a measure of confidence in the ability of governments to solve the complex problems of the nuclear-missile age. This confidence, once established, will facilitate the achievement of broader arms control and disarmament agreements. The test ban treaty is the significant first step toward resolution of nations' differences without war.

Con: Conclusion of a treaty in the near future almost certainly would lead to a popular overestimation of its political benefits and an underestimation of the strategic-military dangers which might lurk within it. It would likely generate euphoric pressures for speedy progress on disarmament schemes involving control arrangements which fall below the threshold of reliability required by national and international security interests. Western nations have learned to their regret that in a world divided by profound political ideological differences the manufacture of artificial good will can be productive of the most unwelcome consequences. Communists will enter no agreement which does not give them a net advantage in their unremitting campaign to destroy the non-Communist world.

#### VI

##### *Test ban treaty risk from surprise abrogation is small*

Pro: Secret preparations and surprise abrogation by the Soviets after a few years might leave us as much as 18 months behind

in our readiness to test. However, we can and will avoid this by a national policy to maintain readiness to test and to provide the funds necessary for this and for the incentive program necessary to keep competent scientists at work in the laboratories. This will minimize any possibility of a long Soviet headstart if the treaty breaks down.

Con: This is dangerously wishful thinking. There simply are no incentives our society can offer which will cause our creative scientists to stay with a dead end program. The Soviet society can arbitrarily assign its most creative minds to secret nuclear research and stimulate them with the reminder that article 49-o of the Soviet Constitution authorizes abrogation of any international agreement or treaty at any time unilaterally. The Soviets would gain a long lead, lengthened further by delays inherent in a democracy's decisionmaking machinery for test resumption.

#### VII

##### *Test ban risk from possible cheating is small*

Pro: Many important nuclear weapons principles can be studied with explosions of less than 3 kilotons and larger ones can be muffled by favorable underground formations or artificial decoupling. Such explosions may go undetected by the test ban treaty detection machinery.

However, such clandestine underground testing would be unsatisfactory for learning the kind of things which might change the military balance against us. According to Disarmament Administrator William C. Foster, little improvement in yield-to-weight ratios can be expected and pure fusion weapons would not be a great advantage to us because primarily they constitute only a cheaper substitute for weapons already in our stockpile. Moreover, testing in natural formations which muffle explosions is risky because it may produce a detectable surface depression, while artificial decoupling is time consuming and expensive.

Con: As stated by Mr. Foster, pure fusion weapons could be developed by clandestine underground testing below detectable yields. This would give the Soviets overwhelming nuclear superiority in both tactical weapons and antimissile warheads which can be used safely over their own country because they do not produce fallout. Yielding effective antimissile capability to the Soviets would nullify our retaliatory capacity and drastically change the military balance against us. The same is true with respect to fallout-free tactical weapons.

Additionally, unless and until we achieve fallout-free tactical pure fusion weapons, we do not possess weapons which are feasible and effective to use for the defense of our NATO and other allies against invasion of their homelands. Abandoning development of such weapons, when its drastic self-defense implications are realized, will surely place unbearable strain on the NATO alliance.

#### VIII

##### *Miscellaneous arguments against test ban*

The committee found the following additional arguments against a test ban treaty at the present time among the expert's papers which were not subject to classification under the preceding "Pro" and "Con" headings:

1. Defense Secretary McNamara recently testified to Congress that the Soviet Union is engaged on a large scale "hardening" program for its missile bases. This can only be met by U.S. retaliatory weapons of much greater yield than we now possess. We must test and achieve them, otherwise our retaliatory capacity will be too weak to deter the Kremlin.

2. Nuclear weaponry is a new science. So far it has produced weapons which are in-

capable of discrimination in their deadly effects. The field of weapons development ahead is toward discrimination in both yield and effects. Although war, if it should ever come, can never be made humane, it can be made considerably less inhumane if refinement of nuclear weapons is allowed to proceed.

3. Should cheating under a treaty be really known to occur, but not be provable according to treaty terms, resultant tensions and apprehensions would create conditions more unstable and dangerous than the absence of any treaty at all.

4. Nuclear technology is here to stay. No treaty can foresee or limit future technological developments in nuclear physics. They cannot be frozen through the legal device of a treaty any more successfully than were earlier attempts to outlaw the science of medicine by dictatorial fiat. Nuclear technology is wedded to delivery systems and to defense systems. These stand at an early point on the development curve. No nation can afford for long to observe inhibitions on its national security interests, therefore no test ban treaty can be expected long to survive.

5. The operators of any system of detection or inspection will tend to become dominated by one or the other parties to the treaty, or just plain sloppy in their work, so the achievement of an enforceable treaty is no more than a dangerous illusion.

6. As a general proposition no treaty will cause the Soviets to do what they would not do in the absence of a treaty. The history of treaties entered into with the Soviet Union demonstrates that they bind, inhibit, or deter only the non-Soviet signatories. The Soviets, therefore, want and will sign a test ban treaty only if they calculate that it will give them a net advantage in their unremitting campaign to destroy the non-Communist world.

CRAIG HOSMER,

*Chairman.*

LESLIE C. ARENDS.

WILLIAM E. MILLER.

MELVIN R. LAIRD.

CHARLES E. GOODSELL.

Ex officio:

CHARLES A. HALLECK.

JOHN W. BYRNES.

GERALD R. FORD.

## OPERATION OF UNITED NATIONS SPECIAL FUND

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter and a table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my continuing investigation into the operations of the United Nations Special Fund, which we find is providing aid to Communist nations at the expense of the American taxpayer, I have requested the unanimous consent of the House to have published at this point in the RECORD a detailed table.

This table will provide ready reference for my colleagues about a number of projects undertaken by the Special Fund, and others approved, but not yet started.

The facts in this table are taken from a U.N. Special Fund publication of De-



cember 1962, which received only limited distribution. The table lists the projects of the Fund by country or territory, the date of approval by the Governing Council of the Fund, the executing agency of the U.N., the total cost of the project and the Special Fund contribution to that cost. The above mentioned follows:

*Status of individual projects approved by the Governing Council of the Special Fund: May 1959–May 1962, as of Oct. 31, 1962*

[NOTE.—Throughout this annex, the figures under "Special fund contribution" indicate gross project costs, i.e., including the recipient Governments' cash contributions to the project budgets]

Project by country or territory	Approved by Governing Council	Executing agency	Duration of project (years)	Costs of individual projects (U.S. dollar equivalents)			Plan of operation signed (date)	Authorization to commence execution (date)
				Total	Special fund contribution	Estimated Government counterpart contribution		
AFGHANISTAN								
Land and water survey and agricultural station.....	December 1959.....	FAO.....	{ 3 5 }	\$1,996,400	\$1,404,000	\$594,400	June 29, 1960	Aug. 15, 1960
ARGENTINA								
Electric power survey <sup>1</sup> .....	May 1959.....	IBRD.....	1½	337,500	287,500	50,000	Sept. 14, 1959	<sup>1</sup> Sept. 14, 1959
Management development and training of super- visory and skilled personnel.....	December 1959.....	ILO.....	5	1,723,500	1,132,500	591,000	Oct. 11, 1960	Oct. 18, 1960
Transport study <sup>2</sup> .....	May 1960.....	IBRD.....	1½	1,045,000	520,000	525,000	Sept. 30, 1960	<sup>1</sup> Oct. 5, 1960
Petroleum Institute.....	December 1960.....	UNESCO.....	5	5,113,100	1,110,100	4,003,000	Aug. 23, 1962	Aug. 23, 1962
Study of nutritional diseases and deficiencies in cattle.....	do.....	FAO.....	5	1,009,800	661,200	348,600	Feb. 7, 1962	Feb. 16, 1962
Forestry and Watershed Management Training Insti- tute, Buenos Aires.....	May 1961.....	FAO.....	5	1,155,100	599,100	556,000	Apr. 12, 1962	Apr. 13, 1962
Study of land reclamation of the Viedma Valley.....	May 1962.....	FAO.....	4	1,385,600	761,600	624,000	-----	-----
BOLIVIA								
Precolonization survey.....	December 1959.....	FAO.....	2-3	429,500	312,500	117,000	Oct. 25, 1960	-----
Agricultural training.....	do.....	FAO.....	3	489,000	375,000	114,000	Aug. 16, 1960	Aug. 23, 1960
Pilot Mineral Survey of the Cordillera and Altiplano.....	May 1961.....	UN.....	4	1,607,000	922,000	685,000	Oct. 30, 1961	Nov. 14, 1961
BRAZIL								
San Francisco River Basin survey.....	December 1959.....	FAO.....	5	2,021,000	<sup>1</sup> 1,533,500	487,500	Oct. 7, 1960	Oct. 12, 1960
National Forestry School, Vicosa.....	May 1961.....	FAO.....	5½	2,241,100	1,265,100	976,000	Dec. 29, 1961	Feb. 13, 1962
Survey of rock salt deposits.....	January 1962.....	UN.....	2½	945,100	595,100	350,000	Aug. 21, 1962	Aug. 29, 1962
Survey of hydroelectric resources in Minas Gerais.....	do.....	IBRD.....	3	1,295,000	735,000	560,000	Oct. 23, 1962	Oct. 26, 1962
BURMA								
Survey of lead and zinc mining and smelting.....	May 1961.....	UN.....	2	823,400	590,400	233,000	Nov. 3, 1961	Nov. 3, 1961
Mineral and ground-water survey.....	January 1962.....	UN.....	4	3,382,600	1,068,600	2,314,000	-----	-----
Expansion of meteorological and hydrological services.....	do.....	WMO.....	3	1,126,600	525,600	601,000	-----	-----
Forest Research Institute.....	May 1962.....	FAO.....	4	2,697,800	954,800	1,743,000	-----	-----
Mu River irrigation survey.....	do.....	UN.....	3	1,504,400	1,054,400	450,000	-----	-----
CAMBODIA								
Center for technical staff training and productivity, Phnom Penh.....	January 1962.....	ILO.....	4	2,038,500	947,500	1,091,000	-----	-----
CAMEROON								
Secondary School Teacher Training Institute, Yaoundé.....	May 1961.....	UNESCO.....	6	2,692,800	1,174,800	1,518,000	Nov. 2, 1961	Nov. 2, 1961
CEYLON								
Establishment of a small industry service institute, Velona.....	January 1962.....	ILO.....	5	2,263,300	942,300	1,321,000	May 23, 1962	June 20, 1962
CHILE								
Hydrometeorological stations.....	December 1959.....	WMO.....	4½	1,815,650	633,500	1,182,150	May 27, 1960	June 13, 1960
Mineral exploration.....	do.....	UN.....	2½	1,719,000	1,080,500	638,500	June 24, 1960	Aug. 3, 1960
Institute for the Development of Forest Resources and Industries.....	December 1960.....	FAO.....	4	2,168,800	1,268,800	900,000	Aug. 2, 1961	Aug. 30, 1961
Faculty of Engineering, University of Concepcion.....	do.....	UNESCO.....	3	1,478,600	1,043,000	435,600	Nov. 7, 1961	Nov. 8, 1961
Instructor and Foreman Training Center, Santiago.....	May 1961.....	ILO.....	5	1,805,100	1,140,100	665,000	-----	-----
Fisheries Development Institute.....	January 1962.....	FAO.....	5	4,408,700	1,448,700	2,960,000	-----	-----
Institute of Occupational Health and Air Pollution Research, Santiago.....	May 1962.....	WHO.....	5	1,215,000	404,000	811,000	-----	-----
CHINA								
Hydraulic development project <sup>1</sup> .....	December 1959.....	UN.....	1	520,075	342,000	178,075	Sept. 20, 1960	<sup>2</sup> Oct. 17, 1960
Telecommunication and Electronics Training and Research Center.....	May 1960.....	ITU.....	3	566,100	296,100	270,000	Mar. 7, 1961	Apr. 18, 1961
Auto technician and instructor training, Taipei.....	May 1962.....	ILO.....	4	1,204,700	695,700	509,000	-----	-----
COLOMBIA								
National Vocational Training Service (SENA).....	December 1959.....	ILO.....	4	1,726,500	561,500	1,165,000	Sept. 1, 1960	Sept. 13, 1960
Soil survey.....	do.....	FAO.....	3	690,050	401,500	288,550	do.....	Oct. 27, 1960
Institute for Technological Research.....	December 1960.....	UN.....	4	1,071,700	558,700	513,000	June 28, 1961	July 6, 1961
Training of engineers, Industrial University of San- tander.....	do.....	UNESCO.....	4	4,008,700	1,509,700	2,499,000	Nov. 30, 1961	Dec. 8, 1961
Agricultural training and research, Cauca Valley.....	May 1961.....	FAO.....	4	1,565,700	931,700	634,000	Oct. 20, 1961	Oct. 23, 1961
Institute for Training and Research in Agricultural Marketing, Bogotá.....	May 1962.....	FAO.....	4	1,817,900	807,900	1,010,000	-----	-----
National Vocational Training Service (SENA).....	do.....	ILO.....	4	1,955,300	793,300	1,162,000	-----	-----
Survey of the Cauca Valley coal deposits.....	do.....	IBRD.....	¾	336,500	216,500	120,000	-----	-----
CONGO (BRAZZAVILLE)								
Secondary School Teacher Training Institute, Brazza- ville.....	January 1962.....	UNESCO.....	6	2,960,200	1,185,200	1,775,000	Oct. 31, 1962	-----
Survey of the water resources of the Niari Valley.....	May 1962.....	FAO.....	3	778,700	631,700	147,000	-----	-----
CUBA								
Central Agricultural Experimental Station, Santiago de las Vegas.....	May 1961.....	FAO.....	5	3,035,600	1,157,600	1,878,000	-----	-----

See footnotes at end of table.

Status of individual projects approved by the Governing Council of the Special Fund: May 1959–May 1962, as of Oct. 31, 1962—Con.

NOTE.—Throughout this annex, the figures under "Special fund contribution" indicate gross project costs, i.e., including the recipient Governments' cash contributions to the project budgets]

Project by country or territory	Approved by Governing Council	Executing agency	Duration of project (years)	Costs of individual projects (U.S. dollar equivalents)			Plan of operation signed (date)	Authorization to commence execution (date)
				Total	Special fund contribution	Estimated Government counterpart contribution		
CYPRUS								
Agricultural Research Institute, Nicosia.....	May 1961.....	FAO.....	5	\$1,944,000	\$787,100	\$1,156,900	Feb. 23, 1962	Apr. 2, 1962
Survey of ground-water mineral resources.....	May 1962.....	UN.....	5	2,935,000	1,340,000	1,595,000		
ECUADOR								
Fisheries Institute.....	December 1959.....	FAO.....	4	1,307,000	693,000	614,000	June 2, 1960	Nov. 4, 1960
Hydrometeorological stations.....	do.....	WMO.....	4	1,204,300	423,500	780,800	June 27, 1960	July 27, 1960
Precolonization survey.....	do.....	FAO.....	2	289,500	168,000	121,500	Aug. 26, 1960	Nov. 22, 1960
National Polytechnic School, Quito.....	May 1961.....	UNESCO.....	5	3,021,400	1,321,400	1,700,000	Jan. 5, 1962	Mar. 1, 1962
Faculty of Agriculture and Veterinary Medicine, Quito.....	May 1962.....	FAO.....	5	2,540,800	1,240,800	1,300,000		
Survey of hydrological resources of Manabi Province.....	do.....	UN.....	2	740,600	487,600	253,000	Oct. 5, 1962	Oct. 19, 1962
EL SALVADOR								
Groundwater resources survey.....	May 1960.....	FAO.....	2	910,800	348,300	562,500	Apr. 4, 1961	Apr. 17, 1961
ETHIOPIA								
Awash River Basin development survey.....	do.....	FAO.....	3	1,257,100	930,100	327,000	Feb. 7, 1961	Feb. 21, 1961
School for Veterinary Assistants.....	December 1960.....	FAO.....	5	722,700	432,700	290,000		
FEDERATION OF MALAYA								
Productivity Center.....	do.....	ILO.....	5	805,400	525,400	280,000	Dec. 20, 1961	Feb. 27, 1962
Telecommunications Training Center, Kuala Lumpur.....	May 1961.....	ITU.....	5	3,327,600	896,100	2,431,500	Dec. 23, 1961	Feb. 24, 1962
GHANA								
Volta River flood plain survey.....	May 1959.....	FAO.....	3	540,000	385,000	155,000	Dec. 9, 1959	Jan. 8, 1960
Institute of Public Administration, Accra.....	May 1961.....	UN.....	5	1,845,700	523,700	1,322,000	July 18, 1961	July 27, 1961
Land and water surveys in the upper and northern regions.....	January 1962.....	FAO.....	3	1,181,700	806,700	375,000	Sept. 28, 1962	Oct. 24, 1962
GREECE								
Ground-water development.....	May 1959.....	FAO.....	3	408,000	298,000	110,000	Dec. 3, 1959	Feb. 3, 1960
Economic survey of the western Peloponnesus.....	December 1960.....	FAO.....	2	942,600	503,600	439,000	May 23, 1961	July 11, 1961
Preinvestment survey of selected forest areas.....	May 1962.....	FAO.....	3	1,077,200	394,200	683,000		
GUATEMALA								
Survey of hydraulic resources for electrification and irrigation.....	December 1960.....	IBRD.....	2	883,500	633,500	250,000	July 28, 1961	Aug. 31, 1961
GUINEA								
General development survey.....	May 1959.....	UN.....	1	425,000	425,000		Jan. 7, 1960	Feb. 25, 1960
HAITI								
Animal husbandry demonstration project, Plaine des Cayes.....	May 1961.....	FAO.....	3	588,800	338,800	250,000	June 6, 1962	June 15, 1962
Land and water surveys in the Gonaives Plain and the Northwest Department.....	January 1962.....	FAO.....	3	1,136,100	665,800	470,300		
HONDURAS								
Survey of pine forests.....	May 1961.....	FAO.....	3	1,002,300	422,300	580,000	Dec. 11, 1961	Jan. 23, 1962
INDIA								
Industrial Instructors Training Institute.....	May 1959.....	ILO.....	3	3,173,500	1,033,500	2,140,000	Feb. 26, 1960	Apr. 4, 1960
Regional Labour Institute.....	December 1959.....	ILO.....	3	1,544,546	381,500	1,163,046	Oct. 6, 1960	Dec. 28, 1960
Mechanical Engineering Research Institute.....	do.....	UNESCO.....	3	1,666,200	725,000	941,200	Jan. 15, 1960	Feb. 16, 1960
Power Engineering Research Institute.....	do.....	UNESCO.....	3	4,698,700	1,981,500	2,717,200	do.....	Mar. 4, 1960
Public Health Engineering Research Institute.....	May 1960.....	WHO.....	4	4,115,000	525,000	3,590,000	May 16, 1961	May 18, 1961
Fisheries Training Institute.....	do.....	FAO.....	3	1,340,300	610,300	730,000	May 28, 1962	July 17, 1962
Mining research station.....	do.....	ILO.....	5	1,535,900	695,900	840,000	Dec. 20, 1960	Jan. 16, 1961
Potential hydropower sites survey.....	do.....	UN.....	3	7,361,400	2,361,400	5,000,000	June 4, 1962	June 29, 1962
Water supply resources of Greater Calcutta survey.....	do.....	WHO.....	2	480,000	324,100	155,900	Sept. 17, 1962	
Central scientific instruments organization.....	December 1960.....	UNESCO.....	3	3,135,500	935,500	2,200,000	Sept. 1, 1962	Oct. 5, 1962
Cavitation Research Center.....	do.....	UN.....	3	574,100	364,100	210,000	Oct. 16, 1962	
National aeronautical research laboratory.....	do.....	ICAO.....	5	8,239,700	1,439,700	6,800,000	June 29, 1961	July 17, 1961
Vocational training scheme for industrial trades in- cluding a central instructors training institute in Kanpur.....	do.....	ILO.....	4	2,740,100	1,050,100	1,690,000	June 7, 1961	Aug. 18, 1961
Central Instructor Training Institute, Madras.....	May 1961.....	ILO.....	3	2,302,000	612,000	1,690,000	Oct. 17, 1961	Jan. 5, 1962
Institute for Petroleum Exploration.....	do.....	UN.....	3	1,834,000	790,300	1,043,700	June 18, 1962	July 30, 1962
National Institute for Training in Industrial Engi- neering, Bombay.....	January 1962.....	ILO.....	5	2,289,000	669,000	1,620,000		
Central Instructor Training Institute, Hyderabad.....	do.....	ILO.....	3	2,302,000	612,000	1,690,000		
Rajasthan Sheep and Wool Institute.....	do.....	FAO.....	5	5,016,000	744,000	4,272,000	Oct. 4, 1962	Oct. 26, 1962
Central Instructor Training Institute, Ludhiana.....	May 1962.....	ILO.....	3	2,353,100	663,100	1,690,000		
INDONESIA								
Building Materials Research Laboratory.....	May 1960.....	UN.....	6	1,245,400	550,900	694,500	May 24, 1961	Nov. 17, 1961
Statistical Research and Development Center, Djakarta.....	January 1962.....	UN.....	5	2,236,400	997,400	1,239,000	Apr. 28, 1962	July 23, 1962
IRAN								
Teheran Polytechnic.....	December 1959.....	UNESCO.....	5	2,582,500	1,432,500	1,150,000	Jan. 31, 1960	Mar. 10, 1960
Soil fertility survey.....	May 1960.....	FAO.....	5	1,613,100	545,100	1,068,000	Nov. 7, 1960	Jan. 3, 1961
Geological Survey Institute.....	December 1960.....	UN.....	5	3,566,300	1,566,300	2,000,000	Jan. 16, 1961	Apr. 27, 1961

See footnotes at end of table.



Status of individual projects approved by the Governing Council of the Special Fund: May 1959–May 1962, as of Oct. 31, 1962—Con.

[NOTE.—Throughout this annex, the figures under "Special fund contribution" indicate gross project costs, i.e., including the recipient Governments' cash contributions to the project budgets]

Project by country or territory	Approved by Governing Council	Executing agency	Duration of project (years)	Costs of individual projects (U.S. dollar equivalents)			Plan of operation signed (date)	Authorization to commence execution (date)
				Total	Special fund contribution	Estimated Government counterpart contribution		
IRAN—continued								
Animal Health Institute.....	December 1960.....	FAO.....	5	\$1,413,500	\$873,500	\$540,000	Apr. 29, 1962	Aug. 27, 1962
Vocational Instructor and Foreman Training Center.....	May 1961.....	ILO.....	4	1,737,400	762,400	975,000	Jan. 31, 1962	Apr. 10, 1962
Forestry and Range Institute and Forest Ranger School, Karaj.....	May 1962.....	FAO.....	6	2,479,900	979,900	1,500,000	-----	-----
IRAC								
Technical Training Institute.....	May 1960.....	UNESCO.....	5	4,834,500	934,500	3,900,000	Feb. 8, 1961	Feb. 16, 1961
Animal Health Institute.....	December 1960.....	FAO.....	5	1,321,700	493,700	828,000	Feb. 19, 1962	May 17, 1962
Management Development and Supervisor Training Center, Baghdad.....	May 1961.....	ILO.....	5	1,027,100	604,100	423,000	Sept. 28, 1961	Oct. 19, 1961
Conservation and development of the lesser Zab Basin.....	January 1962.....	FAO.....	5	1,337,800	837,800	500,000	-----	-----
Telecommunication Training Center, Baghdad.....	do.....	ITU.....	5	2,974,700	909,700	2,065,000	-----	-----
ISRAEL								
Watershed management.....	May 1959.....	FAO.....	5	725,000	375,000	350,000	Dec. 29, 1959	Feb. 7, 1960
Meteorological Institute.....	December 1959.....	WMO.....	4	798,513	319,500	479,013	Apr. 19, 1960	Apr. 21, 1960
Experimental coastal groundwater collectors.....	May 1960.....	FAO.....	2½	1,429,000	341,800	1,087,200	Sept. 5, 1960	Sept. 6, 1960
Training centers for vocational instructors, technicians and foremen.....	December 1960.....	ILO.....	5	2,196,400	816,400	1,380,000	Sept. 4, 1961	Sept. 22, 1961
Ceramic and Silicate Industries Laboratories, Haifa.....	May 1961.....	UN.....	3	665,100	301,200	363,900	Dec. 22, 1961	Jan. 3, 1962
Underground water storage study.....	May 1962.....	FAO.....	3	2,173,300	489,300	1,684,000	-----	-----
IVORY COAST								
Secondary Schoolteacher Training Institute, Abidjan.....	May 1961.....	UNESCO.....	6	3,150,400	1,034,800	2,115,600	Nov. 2, 1961	Dec. 1, 1961
JAPAN								
International Institute of Seismology and Earthquake Engineering.....	January 1962.....	UNESCO.....	5	1,676,800	702,500	974,300	Oct. 31, 1962	-----
JORDAN								
Groundwater survey of the Azraq Area.....	May 1961.....	UN.....	3	1,228,800	811,300	417,500	Nov. 2, 1961	Nov. 13, 1961
LAOS								
Technical training.....	May 1960.....	UNESCO.....	5	1,338,900	583,900	755,000	Dec. 14, 1961	Feb. 15, 1962
LEBANON								
Technical Training Institute.....	do.....	UNESCO.....	5	2,473,800	723,800	1,750,000	Nov. 8, 1960	Dec. 29, 1960
Animal Health Institute.....	December 1960.....	FAO.....	5	1,066,200	598,200	468,000	Feb. 9, 1962	May 17, 1962
Forestry education, training, and research.....	January 1962.....	FAO.....	5	2,260,700	844,700	1,416,000	-----	-----
Flight Safety Center, Beirut.....	May 1962.....	ICAO.....	5	4,421,700	2,288,700	2,133,000	-----	-----
Ground-water survey.....	do.....	UN.....	5	1,966,600	816,600	1,150,000	-----	-----
LIBERIA								
Agricultural training and research.....	December 1960.....	FAO.....	6	1,756,900	1,006,900	750,000	Sept. 18, 1961	Oct. 25, 1961
LIBYA								
College of Advanced Technology.....	December 1959.....	UNESCO.....	5	3,063,950	1,116,000	1,947,950	Sept. 16, 1960	Oct. 3, 1960
Radio and Telecommunications School.....	December 1960.....	ITU.....	5	1,183,600	523,600	660,000	July 5, 1961	July 14, 1961
MALI								
Secondary Schoolteacher Training Institute, Bamako.....	January 1962.....	UNESCO.....	6	3,668,900	1,019,900	2,649,000	Oct. 17, 1962	-----
Improvement and expansion of rice cultivation.....	May 1962.....	FAO.....	5	1,463,000	1,013,000	450,000	Oct. 31, 1962	-----
MEXICO								
National forestry inventory.....	May 1960.....	FAO.....	4	1,461,900	417,900	1,044,000	Apr. 27, 1961	May 4, 1961
Civil Aviation School.....	December 1960.....	ICAO.....	5	2,201,600	844,600	1,357,000	June 30, 1961	July 3, 1961
Survey of metallic mineral deposits.....	January 1962.....	UN.....	3	2,746,600	896,600	1,850,000	July 6, 1962	July 18, 1962
National Center for Technical Teacher Training, Mexico City.....	May 1962.....	UNESCO.....	5	1,698,600	915,600	783,000	-----	-----
MOROCCO								
Engineering School.....	May 1960.....	UNESCO.....	5	2,751,500	751,500	2,000,000	Oct. 8, 1960	Dec. 1, 1960
Rif region development survey.....	do.....	FAO.....	2	1,882,800	702,800	1,180,000	Nov. 1, 1960	Jan. 2, 1961
Civil Aviation School.....	December 1960.....	ICAO.....	5	1,772,200	624,200	1,148,000	June 29, 1961	July 28, 1961
Institute for Instructor Training for Leather and Textile Workers.....	January 1962.....	ILO.....	4	2,472,800	934,800	1,538,000	Oct. 11, 1962	-----
Secondary School teacher Training Institutes, Rabat.....	May 1962.....	UNESCO.....	5	2,743,900	884,900	1,859,000	-----	-----
NEPAL								
Hydroelectric development of the Karnali River.....	May 1961.....	UN.....	3	1,199,400	974,400	225,000	Jan. 16, 1962	Feb. 7, 1962
NETHERLANDS: SURINAM								
Mineral survey.....	May 1960.....	IBRD.....	2	1,462,000	770,000	692,000	Oct. 19, 1960	Oct. 21, 1960
NICARAGUA								
Survey of agricultural and forest resources.....	May 1962.....	FAO.....	4	1,290,900	851,900	439,000	-----	-----
NIGERIA								
Niger River Dam survey.....	December 1959.....	IBRD.....	1	2,425,000	735,000	1,690,000	Mar. 7, 1960	Mar. 10, 1960
Federal Higher Teacher Training College.....	December 1960.....	UNESCO.....	5	2,852,200	1,052,200	1,800,000	Feb. 15, 1962	Mar. 29, 1962
Soil and water resources survey of the Sokoto Valley.....	May 1961.....	FAO.....	4	2,272,800	1,552,800	720,000	Feb. 23, 1962	Mar. 30, 1962
Vocational training program.....	do.....	ILO.....	4	1,507,500	1,002,600	504,900	-----	-----
Fisheries survey in the Western Region.....	do.....	FAO.....	4	829,000	564,000	265,000	-----	-----
Secondary School Teacher Training College, Northern Region.....	January 1962.....	UNESCO.....	5	3,730,200	930,200	2,800,000	-----	-----
Forestry faculty, University College, Ibadan.....	May 1962.....	FAO.....	6	1,561,800	876,800	675,000	-----	-----

See footnotes at end of table.

Status of individual projects approved by the Governing Council of the Special Fund: May 1959–May 1962, as of Oct. 31, 1962—Con.

[NOTE.—Throughout this annex, the figures under "Special fund contribution" indicate gross project costs, i.e., including the recipient Governments' cash contributions to the project budgets]

Project by country or territory	Approved by Governing Council	Executing agency	Duration of project (years)	Costs of individual projects (U.S. dollar equivalents)			Plan of operation signed (date)	Authorization to commence execution (date)
				Total	Special fund contribution	Estimated Government counterpart contribution		
NIGERIA—continued								
Secondary School Teacher Training College, Eastern Region.	May 1962	UNESCO	5	\$3,688,500	\$1,055,500	\$2,633,000		
PAKISTAN								
Mineral survey	December 1959	UN	3	1,933,000	1,643,000	290,000	Sept. 22, 1960	Oct. 31, 1960
Soil survey	do	FAO	4	2,729,950	754,500	1,975,450	Dec. 8, 1960	Jan. 17, 1961
Management Development, Supervisory, and Instructor Training Center, East Pakistan.	May 1960	ILO	5	2,239,000	1,039,000	1,200,000	Sept. 7, 1960	Sept. 22, 1960
Training of engineering and other technical personnel.	do	UNESCO	5	3,424,400	2,294,400	1,130,000	Nov. 12, 1960	Feb. 10, 1961
Hydrological survey in East Pakistan	December 1960	FAO	5	3,845,700	1,645,700	2,200,000	Nov. 18, 1961	Dec. 4, 1961
National forestry research and training program	May 1961	FAO	5	4,589,800	1,061,800	3,528,000		
Polytechnic Institute, Chittagong	January 1962	UNESCO	5	3,512,500	856,500	2,656,000		
Manpower planning	do	ILO	5	868,100	695,100	173,000		
Management development and industrial training scheme for West Pakistan.	May 1962	ILO	4	2,656,000	1,494,000	1,162,000		
PARAGUAY								
Technical Standards Institute	do	UN	5	908,900	543,900	365,000		
PERU								
Marine Resources Research Institute	December 1959	FAO	4	1,766,500	790,500	976,000	Apr. 21, 1960	June 2, 1960
Precolonization survey	do	FAO	2	426,689	219,000	207,689	Feb. 13, 1961	Mar. 1, 1961
Vocational Instructors Training Institute	do	ILO	4	734,066	514,500	219,566	Nov. 25, 1960	Dec. 22, 1960
Hydrometeorological services	May 1960	WMO	4	1,862,300	788,300	1,074,000	Jan. 5, 1961	Jan. 16, 1961
Institute of Agricultural Engineering, National School of Agriculture.	December 1960	FAO	5	985,500	633,500	352,000	Sept. 28, 1961	Oct. 2, 1961
Resources surveys in central Peru (Peru Via)	May 1961	IBRD	4	2,507,000	1,277,000	1,230,000		
Veterinary Institute for Tropical and High Altitude Research.	January 1962	FAO	4	2,247,900	902,900	1,345,000		
Irrigation of the Pampas de Olmos	do	FAO	3	1,752,700	785,700	967,000		
Forestry research and training	May 1962	FAO	5	1,289,800	751,800	538,000		
PHILIPPINES								
Telecommunications Training Institute	May 1961	ITU	5	1,631,300	968,600	662,700	June 5, 1962	June 13, 1962
Dairy Training and Research Institute	January 1962	FAO	5	1,690,000	756,000	934,000	Sept. 19, 1962	Oct. 16, 1962
Institute of Applied Geology, Manila	do	UN	5	1,403,000	704,000	699,000	July 6, 1962	July 11, 1962
POLAND								
Training Center for Supervisory Personnel in Industry.	May 1959	ILO	3	3,517,000	817,000	2,500,000	Feb. 1, 1960	Mar. 7, 1960
Research and extension services for food production, processing, and utilization.	January 1962	FAO	4	4,651,500	1,020,500	3,631,000		
REPUBLIC OF KOREA								
Tidal land reclamation survey	December 1960	FAO	3	1,022,000	586,200	435,800	Sept. 12, 1961	Sept. 28, 1961
Agricultural survey and demonstration in selected watersheds.	May 1961	FAO	5	936,100	563,100	373,000	Oct. 5, 1961	Nov. 14, 1961
Productivity Center, Seoul	January 1962	ILO	5	1,608,500	778,500	830,000	Aug. 15, 1962	Aug. 16, 1962
Telecommunications Training Center, Seoul	May 1962	ITU	5	2,291,600	1,288,600	1,003,000	Oct. 1, 1962	
REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM								
Mineral survey	December 1959	UN	3	421,400	268,500	152,900	Dec. 14, 1960	Jan. 24, 1961
SAUDI ARABIA								
Land and water surveys in the Wadi Jizan	December 1960	FAO	2	1,512,100	431,600	1,080,500	Oct. 24, 1961	Nov. 27, 1961
Higher Institute of Technology, Riyadh	May 1961	UNESCO	5	3,002,500	965,500	2,037,000	Aug. 28, 1962	
Pilot Experimental Farm and Agricultural Center	May 1962	FAO	5	1,371,600	680,600	691,000		
SENEGAL								
Instructor and Foreman Training Center	May 1961	ILO	4	1,625,500	486,600	1,138,900	Feb. 14, 1962	Mar. 28, 1962
Secondary School Teacher Training Institute, Dakar	January 1962	UNESCO	6	3,179,700	1,144,700	2,035,000	Oct. 5, 1962	
Rural vocational training program	do	ILO	4	2,680,200	1,408,200	1,272,000		
SOMALIA								
Agricultural and water surveys	December 1960	FAO	4	1,218,800	928,800	290,000	Sept. 30, 1961	Nov. 3, 1961
Iron ore survey	January 1962	UN	4	874,300	594,300	280,000		
SUDAN								
Animal Health Institute	December 1960	FAO	4	459,900	264,900	195,000	Mar. 31, 1962	May 17, 1962
Hides, skins and leather: Development and training project.	do	FAO	4	868,600	521,000	347,600	May 3, 1961	June 14, 1961
Forestry Research and Education Center, Khartoum	May 1961	FAO	5	1,222,600	832,600	390,000	Dec. 19, 1961	Dec. 21, 1961
Land water use survey of Kordofan Province	do	FAO	6	1,389,900	889,900	500,000	Oct. 10, 1961	Nov. 20, 1961
Secondary Schoolteacher Training Institute, Khartoum	do	UNESCO	5	3,015,400	1,074,400	1,941,000	Dec. 31, 1961	Jan. 12, 1962
Post and Telegraph Training Center, Khartoum	January 1962	ITU	5	1,936,900	486,900	1,450,000		
Electric power survey	May 1962	IBRD	1	141,200	115,200	26,000		
Land and water use and resources survey in the Jebel Marra area.	do	FAO	4	3,056,100	1,136,100	1,920,000	Sept. 23, 1962	
SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC								
Ground-water resources survey	December 1959	FAO	3	1,045,500	507,000	538,500	Sept. 29, 1960	Dec. 28, 1960
Food processing project	December 1960	FAO	5	896,300	568,300	328,000	Apr. 30, 1961	May 16, 1961
Damascus Agricultural Research Station	January 1962	FAO	5	1,243,200	663,200	580,000		
Higher Polytechnic Institute, Damascus	May 1962	UNESCO	5	3,611,300	1,121,300	2,490,000		
Planning the integrated agricultural development of the Ghab region.	do	FAO	4	1,457,500	766,500	691,000		

See footnotes at end of table.



Status of individual projects approved by the Governing Council of the Special Fund: May 1959–May 1962, as of Oct. 31, 1962—Con.

[NOTE.—Throughout this annex, the figures under "Special fund contribution" indicate gross project costs, i.e., including the recipient Governments' cash contributions to the project budgets]

Project by country or territory	Approved by Governing Council	Executing agency	Duration of project (years)	Costs of individual projects (U.S. dollar equivalents)			Plan of operation signed (date)	Authorization to commence execution (date)
				Total	Special fund contribution	Estimated Government counterpart contribution		
THAILAND								
Siltation study of Bangkok Port.....	May 1959.....	IRBD.....	3½	\$1,365,000	\$1,015,000	\$350,000	July 10, 1961	July 24, 1961
Civil Aviation Training Center.....	May 1960.....	ICAO.....	5	3,027,400	1,339,600	1,687,800	Apr. 10, 1961	Apr. 18, 1961
Productivity Center, Bangkok.....	May 1961.....	ILO.....	5	779,900	567,300	212,600	Jan. 18, 1962	Feb. 14, 1962
Technical Institute, Thonburi.....	do.....	UNESCO.....	5	3,035,700	1,081,700	1,954,000		
Research and Training Center for rice protection.....	January 1962.....	FAO.....	5	1,124,300	606,300	518,000	July 20, 1962	Sept. 8, 1962
Expansion of Meteorological Services.....	do.....	WMO.....	3	581,300	330,300	251,000		
TURKEY								
Middle East Technical University.....	May 1959.....	UNESCO.....	4	9,831,287	1,664,000	8,167,287	Dec. 14, 1959	Jan. 30, 1960
Antalya region development.....	May 1960.....	FAO.....	3	832,600	359,600	473,000	Oct. 21, 1960	Feb. 7, 1961
Poplar Institute.....	January 1962.....	FAO.....	4	1,919,600	644,600	1,275,000	May 2, 1962	June 27, 1962
UGANDA								
Aerial geophysical survey.....	May 1960.....	UN.....	1	453,500	313,500	140,000	Nov. 30, 1960	Dec. 15, 1960
Kampala Technical Institute.....	January 1962.....	UNESCO.....	6	5,112,500	1,159,500	3,953,000		
UNITED ARAB REPUBLIC								
Drainage of irrigated land.....	May 1959.....	FAO.....	3	1,365,000	365,000	1,000,000	Dec. 27, 1960	Feb. 21, 1961
Soil survey from aerial photographs.....	do.....	FAO.....	4	827,500	327,500	500,000	Mar. 10, 1960	May 24, 1960
Civil Aviation Training School.....	May 1960.....	ICAO.....	5	1,860,500	1,063,400	797,100	Apr. 17, 1961	May 18, 1961
Cotton Research Laboratory.....	December 1960.....	FAO.....	4	1,465,300	687,300	778,000	Dec. 26, 1961	May 31, 1962
Animal Health Institute.....	do.....	FAO.....	4	1,005,000	608,000	397,000	Aug. 8, 1962	Oct. 4, 1962
Vocational Instructor Training Institute.....	do.....	ILO.....	4	1,447,100	888,100	559,000	Aug. 20, 1961	Oct. 5, 1961
National Institute of Standards.....	May 1961.....	UNESCO.....	5	4,973,700	973,700	4,000,000		
Central Agricultural Pesticides Laboratory, Cairo.....	do.....	FAO.....	4	986,000	616,000	370,000	May 5, 1962	Sept. 12, 1962
Establishment of an Institute of Small Industries, Kubba.....	January 1962.....	ILO.....	4	1,298,600	600,600	698,000		
Mansoura Institute for Higher Education.....	May 1962.....	UNESCO.....	5	4,870,400	1,756,400	3,114,000		
TOGO								
Land and water use survey.....	May 1960.....	FAO.....	3	963,000	700,000	263,000	Dec. 23, 1960	Jan. 11, 1961
Survey of groundwater and mineral resources.....	January 1962.....	UN.....	3	1,793,500	1,273,500	520,000	Aug. 21, 1962	Sept. 4, 1962
TUNISIA								
Agricultural Research, central Tunisia.....	May 1960.....	FAO.....	5	2,457,200	897,200	1,560,000	Sept. 13, 1960	Sept. 23, 1960
Civil Aviation School.....	December 1960.....	ICAO.....	5	1,787,500	640,500	1,147,000	Sept. 19, 1961	Sept. 27, 1961
Research and training on irrigation with saline water.....	January 1962.....	UNESCO.....	5	1,817,800	971,800	846,000		
Vocational Training and Productivity Institute, Radès.....	do.....	ILO.....	5	2,644,700	1,018,700	1,626,000		
UNITED KINGDOM: BRITISH GUIANA								
Siltation study, Georgetown Harbour.....	December 1959.....	IBRD.....	2	421,500	278,000	143,500	Apr. 8, 1960	Apr. 15, 1960
Soil survey.....	May 1960.....	FAO.....	3	879,000	491,000	388,000	Nov. 9, 1960	Dec. 8, 1960
Survey of Canje Reservoir scheme.....	May 1961.....	FAO.....	1½	605,000	352,000	253,000	Dec. 30, 1961	Jan. 11, 1962
Aerial geophysical survey.....	January 1962.....	UN.....	3	1,340,800	640,800	700,000	June 14, 1962	June 14, 1962
UNITED KINGDOM: COLONY OF NORTH BORNEO								
Surveys of the Labuk Valley.....	December 1960.....	UN.....	3	1,559,900	769,900	790,000	Aug. 11, 1961	Aug. 30, 1961
UNITED KINGDOM: FEDERATION OF RHODESIA AND NYASALAND								
Multipurpose survey of the Kafue River Basin.....	May 1961.....	FAO.....	4	1,375,100	786,100	589,000	Feb. 23, 1962	May 16, 1962
Lake Fariba Fisheries Research Institute.....	January 1962.....	FAO.....	4	1,107,200	555,200	552,000		
UNITED KINGDOM: KENYA								
Training of engineers for East Africa.....	May 1962.....	UNESCO.....	5	1,756,600	832,600	924,000		
The Kenya Polytechnic, Nairobi.....	do.....	UNESCO.....	6	2,308,100	1,428,100	880,000		
Survey of the irrigation potential of the Lower Tana River Basin.....	do.....	FAO.....	3	1,297,100	974,100	323,000		
UNITED KINGDOM: MALTA								
Polytechnic Institute.....	May 1960.....	UNESCO.....	5	1,501,200	601,200	900,000	Mar. 22, 1961	May 9, 1961
UPPER VOLTA								
Agricultural Training Center, Bobo-Dioulasso.....	May 1962.....	FAO.....	5	1,840,900	1,040,900	800,000		
URUGUAY								
Vocational Instructor Training Institute, Montevideo.....	January 1962.....	ILO.....	4	1,585,200	874,200	711,000		
VENEZUELA								
Agricultural survey of selected watersheds in the northwest.....	December 1960.....	FAO.....	3	1,778,700	778,700	1,000,000	June 30, 1962	Aug. 13, 1962
National Polytechnic Institute.....	January 1962.....	UNESCO.....	5	4,899,700	1,254,700	3,645,000		
School of Industrial Engineering, Central University, Caracas.....	May 1962.....	UNESCO.....	5	4,753,300	1,038,300	3,715,000		
YUGOSLAVIA								
Training of vocational instructors.....	May 1959.....	ILO.....	4	7,511,500	1,044,000	6,467,500	Dec. 31, 1959	Jan. 21, 1960
Pilot land reclamation project.....	December 1960.....	FAO.....	4	3,932,100	1,037,100	2,895,000	May 19, 1962	May 22, 1962
Nuclear research and training in agriculture.....	May 1962.....	IAEA.....	3	1,752,400	546,400	1,206,000		

See footnotes at end of table.

Status of individual projects approved by the Governing Council of the Special Fund: May 1959–May 1962, as of Oct. 31, 1962—Con.

[NOTE.—Throughout this annex, the figures under "Special fund contribution" indicate gross project costs, i.e., including the recipient Governments' cash contributions to the project budgets]

Project by country or territory	Approved by Governing Council	Executing agency	Duration of project (years)	Costs of individual projects (U.S. dollar equivalents)			Plan of operation signed (date)	Authorization to commence execution (date)
				Total	Special fund contribution	Estimated Government counterpart contribution		
REGIONAL: THE AMERICAS								
Industrial Research Institute <sup>1</sup> -----	May 1959-----	UN-----	5-----	\$2,238,000-----	<sup>7</sup> \$2,238,000-----	-----	May 10, 1960-----	May 10, 1960-----
Engineering faculty, University of the West Indies <sup>2</sup> -----	December 1959-----	UNESCO-----	5-----	3,426,940-----	904,000-----	\$2,522,940-----	Aug. 25, 1960-----	Aug. 30, 1960-----
Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences <sup>3</sup> -----	December 1960-----	FAO-----	5-----	8,212,000-----	4,001,000-----	4,211,000-----	-----	-----
Latin American Development Institute <sup>4</sup> -----	January 1962-----	UN-----	5-----	4,188,500-----	3,068,500-----	1,120,000-----	June 8, 1962-----	June 18, 1962-----
Study for development of telecommunications in Central America <sup>5</sup> -----	May 1962-----	IBRD-----	1-----	895,000-----	770,000-----	125,000-----	-----	-----
REGIONAL: ASIA AND THE FAR EAST								
Mekong tributary survey <sup>6</sup> -----	December 1959-----	UN-----	4-----	1,733,700-----	1,469,000-----	324,700-----	May 4, 1960-----	( <sup>11</sup> )-----
Hydrographic survey of the lower Mekong <sup>6</sup> -----	December 1960-----	UN-----	2-----	667,000-----	347,000-----	320,000-----	May 31, 1961-----	July 24, 1961-----
Laos and Thailand: Survey of minerals and mineral processing industries-----	May 1961-----	UN-----	2-----	569,300-----	424,300-----	145,000-----	Oct. 20, 1961-----	( <sup>10</sup> )-----
Cambodia and Republic of Vietnam: Mekong River delta model study-----	do-----	UNESCO-----	3-----	758,800-----	642,800-----	116,000-----	May 2, 1962-----	May 25, 1962-----
INTERREGIONAL								
Desert locust <sup>12</sup> -----	December 1959-----	FAO-----	6-----	3,866,000-----	<sup>16</sup> 3,866,000-----	-----	Apr. 9, 1960 <sup>17</sup> -----	June 8, 1960-----
Total-----	-----	-----	-----	497,047,716-----	210,254,900-----	286,792,816-----	-----	-----

<sup>1</sup> Project completed in June 1960.

<sup>2</sup> Project completed in February 1962.

<sup>3</sup> "Special fund contribution" includes, in addition to cash payments by the Government for local costs, a cash counterpart contribution equivalent to \$405,000.

<sup>4</sup> Project concluded in March 1961.

<sup>5</sup> Project completed in April 1961.

<sup>6</sup> Participants: Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua.

<sup>7</sup> Cash counterpart contributions by the participating governments totaling the equivalent of \$1,300,000 included under "Special fund contribution."

<sup>8</sup> Participants: Jamaica, Trinidad and Tobago, and the United Kingdom on behalf of British Guiana and its non-self-governing territories in the Caribbean.

<sup>9</sup> Participants: All member countries of the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences.

<sup>10</sup> Requesting Governments: Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, and Venezuela.

<sup>11</sup> Participants: Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama.

<sup>12</sup> Participants: Cambodia, Laos, Republic of Vietnam, and Thailand.

<sup>13</sup> Laos and Thailand, July 14, 1960, Cambodia, Dec. 8, 1960, and Republic of Vietnam, June 14, 1961.

<sup>14</sup> Thailand, Nov. 3, 1961, and Laos, Sept. 21, 1962.

<sup>15</sup> Participants: Cameroon, Chad, Ethiopia, France and the French Community, Ghana, India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Republic, Yemen, and the United Kingdom for and on behalf of Aden Colony and Protectorate, British Trust Territory of the Cameroons, Gambia, Kenya, Tanganyika, Uganda, and the Gulf States.

<sup>16</sup> Cash counterpart contributions by the participating governments totaling the equivalent of \$1,390,850 included under "Special fund contribution."

<sup>17</sup> Operations limited to those countries whose governments have completed their initial obligations.

## NEW RESIDUAL OIL IMPORT QUOTA ALLOCATIONS

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NYGAARD. Mr. Speaker, this morning I delivered a letter to the Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall, requesting the Department withhold publication of new residual oil import quota allocations until the projected schedules have been reviewed by key interested Members of the House of Representatives.

In view of the statements made on this floor by many of my colleagues, expressing concern over the increase in the quotas for foreign residual oil, I believe they will be interested in the request I have made to the Secretary of the Interior.

FEBRUARY 27, 1963.

HON. STEWART L. UDALL,  
Secretary, Department of the Interior,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Since it is customary, I believe, for your office to announce a month in advance the oil import allocations for the year beginning April 1, it is likely that such an announcement is now in preparation.

It would logically be assumed that, because of the disastrous economic losses incurred by coal mining and oil producing regions as a consequence of the present high

levels of oil imports, a reduction in shipments of foreign oil to this country will be ordered for the year beginning April 1. Since conditions of high unemployment in this country have not thus far been taken into consideration in the administration of the oil import control program, however, there does exist the grave possibility that those charged with the responsibility of setting the quota limitations will permit incoming oil shipments to be increased rather than reduced. For this reason I urgently request that you postpone any action on the new schedule until it is discussed with Members of Congress whose constituencies are affected.

As representative of lignite mining communities whose very existences are imperiled by the waves of foreign residual oil inundating the Nation's fuel markets, and as a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I would, of course, appreciate an opportunity to preview the projections and to discuss them with designated authorities in your office. Because, however, you may prefer to limit further the number of those so favored, I would suggest that the matter could be handled satisfactorily by the chairmen and senior ranking members of these committees: Interior and Insular Affairs, Foreign Affairs, Ways and Means.

Obviously, the senior members of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee are familiar with the impact of foreign oil on the domestic fuel industries. Foreign Affairs members are in better position to ascertain to what extent commitments might have been made to President Betancourt of Venezuela during his visit to Washington last week. Members of the Ways and Means Committee are cognizant of the promises made to Congress on limiting oil imports from the time that the national security

amendment to the Trade Agreements Act was first adopted.

I am confident that my colleagues here named would make an objective analysis of the proposed new import schedules and could, with more than a fair degree of accuracy, indicate to your office the probable reactions on the part of the House should the revised schedule again prove to be as offensive to the American economy as in the past year.

I shall appreciate your notifying all interested parties that the publication of new imports schedules will be delayed as long as is necessary for adjustments that will be in keeping with the will of Congress and the welfare of the United States.

Copies of this letter are being sent to Members of the House indicated above, and I shall ask that a copy of my letter to you be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Thank you for your kind attention.

Sincerely,

HJALMAR C. NYGAARD,  
Member of Congress.

## MR. KHRUSHCHEV AND CUBA

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the lead story in the Washington Star last night, and I assume all of the Associated Press papers across the Nation, told a most interesting story and one which should send cold chills down the spine of most Americans.



It told of a big political speech made by Mr. Khrushchev in his one-party election campaign. He said the Soviet Union "would come to the aid of its friends" should the West launch any attack on Cuba or Red China.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the first real proof we have had that Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Kennedy consider Cuba as Soviet territory. It is the first real proof we have had that the President has abandoned "our friends"—the free people of Cuba to the Communist dictatorship.

This brings the American people face to face with facts. Where do we stand? Have we actually abandoned the principles of freedom? Have we completely abandoned the Monroe Doctrine? Has this administration turned its back on the men who gave their lives in every war this Nation has fought to make the world or at least the Western Hemisphere safe for democracy?

When Mr. Khrushchev says he will go to the aid of his friends in Cuba is he referring to anyone other than Castro and a few of his hierarchy? What about the Cuban people? We fought one war to free them; do we now stand by and watch them ground under the slave heel of the Kremlin?

The American people want some answers. They want some facts and they want them now. Just what deals has this administration made and who has been traded off to whom?

#### THE NEW YORK NEWSPAPER STRIKE

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the New York newspaper strike long since ceased serving any useful purpose. No one has benefited; everyone has been irreparably hurt.

The chief damage has been done to the public. The public has been deeply prejudiced by this strike. And, for that reason the Federal Government should have moved on this long ago. The former Secretary of Labor, Mr. Goldberg, established a precedent of intervention in crisis strikes. He went up to New York during the Metropolitan Opera strike and forced the parties together. And yet it is argued now that the Federal Government cannot intervene in a local strike.

I do not know of a strike that has more serious overtones and undertones than does this one. The news blackout means that Government is operating in camera. It is the process of daily public scrutiny that keeps governments acting honestly and in the public interest. The public right to know is one of the most important rights ingrained in any democracy. It is important because governments will not long remain free and honest in the absence of a public press.

In my view Government and governmental processes have abandoned the public in this case.

Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Robert G. Spivack, a distinguished newspaperman, published three articles on the subject of the New York newspaper strike. They are well worth reading, and I am taking the liberty of inserting them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

#### THE LONELY METROPOLIS

Lively, lovely, exciting New York—Baghdad-on-the-Hudson—is today a mute, paralyzed, crippled city. She is like a helpless creature, unexpectedly stricken dumb and deaf. Dazed and staring vacantly, she is obviously in distress and yet so powerless to summon help.

People still rush about, the subways are crowded, the lights blink on Broadway. There are a handful of tradition-breakers who snatch a Philadelphia or Newark paper, or one of the half-dozen makeshift dailies, hastily patched together. The early morning gazers still stand outside the NBC studios watching the Today show. There are the curious in Pennsylvania station who pick up a clipboard to which has been clamped the latest UPI copy.

Superficially not much is different—until you start to talk to New Yorkers. Then you realize that nothing is the same and the full impact of what has happened starts to become apparent.

A great sadness has descended on the city, such as marked the passing of a beloved friend like, if you remember, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Are the newspapers missed? Has television filled the news gap?

I have never seen the big town or its inhabitants so glazed or so lonely or reacting so inadequately. At one moment it is as if some nerve gas has quietly seeped over the city and asphyxiated its residents. At other times you get the feeling that Manhattan Island has been set adrift from the mainland and silently floated out to sea.

The New Yorker feels cut off from America and the visitor from Washington is earnestly questioned about the outside world. There is probably no other American city where this would be quite so true, where the newspapers play such a vital role. The New York press is the heart of the big town through which its lifeblood flows. Without its papers the city is half-dead.

The printers' strike has been a catastrophe and it was unnecessary from the outset.

I say this as a union man.

I am a member of the American Newspaper Guild, have been for most of my adult life. There have been numerous strikes which, I felt, were justified. I intend to remain a member of the guild.

But I have taken no loyalty oath to Mr. Bert Powers of the ITU. Nor do I feel obliged to remain silent when a union leader makes a fool of himself.

Mr. Powers and a small clique in the New York locals of the ITU are primarily responsible for the strike. He may wrap himself in a mantle of rectitude. But Mr. Powers is no hero to organized labor, nor to the unorganized layman.

There is not a union leader in New York with whom I have spoken who has had a good word to say for the course Mr. Powers has charted. But they do their grumbling in silence or within "the club." This is unfortunate, because a word from a responsible union leader would carry weight.

What has happened, though, is that many who grew up in the thirties find themselves entrapped by their own rhetoric. There must always be labor unity. The boss, or in this case the publishers, must always be wrong.

This is one time when neither slogan is adequate. With all the publishers' shortcomings and all the rigidity of other years, most union leaders in New York say privately that Powers' bargaining methods and demands were outrageous, that no publisher in this economically distressed industry could acquiesce and no paper could continue to publish in the manner to which New Yorkers have grown accustomed.

Perhaps Powers' greatest error has been that he has demonstrated such poor generalship. He left no room to maneuver. He provided no escape hatches for either the publishers or the ITU. He took a desperate gamble in December when, before the Christmas advertising was over, he decided to strike. It was a massive miscalculation.

When it did not pay off, when the non-strike papers also shut down, a mature labor leader would have left other courses of action open for himself. In all his grandiose planning, Mr. Powers overlooked this elementary fact of all warfare, whether it is political or military or labor. Instead he boxed himself in and thus far has not figured a way out.

#### WHO HAS BEEN HURT BY THE NEWSPAPER STRIKE?

New Yorkers are a special breed and, as a result, they are often misunderstood by those who live in other parts of the country.

To a visitor New York is an exciting town, but its people are strange. They hardly ever smile. Some seem fierce and withdrawn. Others act as if their mission in life is just to separate you and your cash. Frequently New Yorkers seem to look down on the outlander, regarding him as uncultured, uninformed, and a hick.

That, in part at least, is the background of the well-known comment, "New York is a nice place to visit but I wouldn't want to live there."

As one who came east from Ohio and grew to know and love New York, I believe this picture is a distortion. It is worth considering, though, why New Yorkers are different.

There are 8 million people from divergent backgrounds. If one does not wish to become involved with anyone else's interests and problems, the easiest way is to be withdrawn. The tendency for each man to become an island unto himself is not hard to understand. It is a protective defense against invasion of privacy.

Sometimes it is overdone. Some New Yorkers are so withdrawn they do not know their neighbor's name. Others do not start the day by saying, "Good morning." This is sad. It is one more reason why every New Yorker ought to be required to visit west of the Hudson, at least before he can be considered well educated.

But as their substitute for traveling, New Yorkers turn almost instinctively to the newspapers. As a result the city has been compelled to develop the best newspapers in the country; their readers are critical and demanding.

There are other towns with one good newspaper. But New Yorkers support seven of which at least six possess unusual qualities. Half the city's inhabitants read at least one newspaper daily. These reading habits have developed over the years. The morning newspaper is as important to start the day as that first cup of coffee.

So when Mr. Bert Powers of the International Typographical Union pulled what has turned out to be his disastrous printers' strike, the first victim was the newspaper reader. Shutting down the New York press was like ripping a delicate fabric. In this case the unseen damage done is not likely to be easily or quickly repaired.

Perhaps that is why for over 80 years the ITU has not gone on strike in New York. The union's earlier leaders were no less

tough than Mr. Powers. They may have been wiser. In any event they were part of the newspaper tradition and the city's social structure.

If you have not lived in New York it may be difficult to understand the unique role that the press plays. But everyone can understand the economic damage of the strike. It has virtually bankrupted the Newspaper Guild and many individual newspapermen. But it has also vitally affected others.

The small businessman who advertises in the big papers hoping to get someone to his shop or to get orders by mail has been acutely injured. He cannot afford the more costly advertising on radio or television, which is also too fleeting. He has no facilities for compiling direct mail lists and anyhow that cannot be done overnight.

The big department stores have also been damaged. Hardly anyone knows what they have to offer. Book publishers and authors have been cruelly affected. A man spends a year writing a book. If it came out during the strike, who would know it? It is not reviewed in any New York newspaper.

For the theaters and movie houses the winter has been bleak. There is a cheaply printed yellow sheet of what's playing called the "emergency list," available in the hotels. But if you do not live in a hotel, what then?

But those who have been most seriously injured of all are those who are out of work. The city's vast army of jobless do not know where to turn. Shall an unemployed man first travel to Brooklyn, or to Queens? Is there something opening in the garment center? Does a law firm need a young typist? For the unemployed page 1 is the page that lists job opportunities.

There are vast areas from one end of the big city to another. It's expensive to get around at 30 cents a round trip on the subway if you do not know which spots to hit first. If you try to telephone, you soon discover that others are doing the same. The line is always busy.

It's ironic that those who are already spiritually wounded and so badly demoralized by unemployment should now find themselves further injured by a strike nobody wanted.

#### LOSERS ALL

One day, of course, the strike ends in a compromise. The combatants feel a bit foolish, like two old friends who have been in a brawl. The victims try to pull themselves together. Everybody hopes it won't happen again.

If the newspaper strike in New York had been an ordinary strike, let us say of bus drivers, or coal miners, or building maintenance workers, life would go on after the settlement pretty much as before the conflict. This Nation has survived many strikes and the damage is usually not permanent.

Certainly these are times when workers, through their unions, must strike.

But the newspaper strike was entirely different and the lessons to be drawn from it are different. It is difficult to figure out what, if anything, has been gained by the strike. There is no problem about figuring out what has been lost.

First there was the tearing of the social fabric of New York. The newspaper readers were the innocent bystanders in a fight that basically did not concern them. Then there was the loss of income for the newspaper employees, the publishers, and the advertisers.

Estimates vary, but probably \$40 to \$50 million was lost, some of it never to be regained. Then there were unmeasurable losses. How do you figure how badly hurt New York's unemployed were by their inability to obtain a daily listing of job opportunities?

Aside from all this is the damage done to the New York press at a crucial point, when the very survival of certain publications is jeopardized.

As everyone knows, newspaper publishing has been an economically sick industry. But at a time when responsible unions and publishers should be engaging in a joint effort to see what might be done to nurture it back to health, some hotheads in the New York locals of the International Typographical Union decided to start a brawl.

This strike was comparable to kicking the patient out of bed, using a meat ax on his medicine chest, pounding him senseless, and then asking why he does not get up and do his job.

If the newspapers are to regain their strength and if the printers' union is to regain its prestige, then it is important to think about where we go from here. Some changes in union leadership would probably be salutary. But for now let's examine the broader issues.

Even though the New York printers' chief bungled it and scarcely bothered to make a public case, there is something that has worried the ITU for many years. It is a matter of legitimate concern: How automation will affect the printers' craft. There is no doubt that the newspapers will eventually automate. To survive they must modernize.

But if that is what really underlay this explosion, then it was the ITU's job to start working with the publishers to see how modernization could take place without dislodging those now working and how to make the transition with a minimum of joblessness.

In fairness to the union, it must be acknowledged that this will not be easy, nor the negotiations simple. Other industries have not set a very good example and other unions have also been asleep on the job. But to adopt a head-in-the-sand approach helps neither unions nor publishers.

Next we should consider future relations between the unions. The New York strike has virtually bankrupted the Newspaper Guild, which has mortgaged itself for what is probably the normal lifetime of its present membership. On the other hand, the ITU is building up a national strike fund estimated at somewhere from \$17,500,000 to \$20 million.

If the ITU expects future cooperation, then the least it could do would be to repay the Newspaper Guild and the other newspaper unions all the funds that they laid out in strike benefits. Unfortunately no one will be in a position to reimburse the employees for what they lost in pay or the employers for their loss in revenue.

But even more important, there must be a complete reexamination of how a newspaper strike can be called. So long as there is not one big newspaper union but a conglomeration of small unions, then no strike should be called until there is substantial agreement among the rank-and-file as well as the leaders on whether there is to be a strike.

The least that ought to come out of this strike is a greater degree of union democracy. No one, newspapermen least of all, wants to be part of a union of sheep.

#### GOVERNMENT COPYRIGHT PRACTICES NEED INVESTIGATION

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, in the last Congress I introduced a resolution

that would authorize an investigation into the practices of Government copyrights.

That this issue remains a current problem is evidenced by the exchange of letters I am appending for the consideration of my colleagues:

MR. ABRAM CHAYES' LETTER TO PROFESSOR CHARLES FOSTER REGARDING GOVERNMENT COPYRIGHTS

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
Washington, D.C., February 5, 1963.

Mr. CHARLES R. FOSTER,  
Assistant Professor of Political Science, De-  
Pauw University, Greencastle, Ind.

DEAR PROFESSOR FOSTER: I have been asked by the Secretary to reply to your letter of January 24, 1963, questioning the permissibility of publication by Beacon Press, Inc., of a selection of his official statements and speeches in a book entitled "Winds of Freedom." You also express the view that the publication may be a violation of the Copyright Act.

The Department of State authorized Beacon Press to undertake this publication in order to obtain a more widespread public awareness of the foreign policy positions of the U.S. Government than would normally be available through use of the Government Printing Office. Beacon Press was, and is, able to bring to bear its machinery for promotion and publicity to achieve this end. It undertook this project in a spirit of public service with no intention of recovering more than its costs. Moreover, the Department of State itself has sought no profit from the agreement, nor will the Secretary or Mr. Lindley receive any royalties or other compensation from the publication of the book.

Beacon Press has informally assured the Department that its procurement of a copyright on the book was a regrettable inadvertence, and that it is taking steps to remedy the situation. In any event, the Department has reason to conclude that at least the format of the material may be copyrighted, whatever else may not be. However, the provisions of the Department's arrangements with Beacon Press make it very clear that the material is available to other publishers on the same terms as it has been made available to Beacon Press.

You may feel certain that access to those materials through official channels of the Government is still open to you and all other Americans. Indeed, it is our hope that publication of the book will stir enough interest so that many other Americans will be led to avail themselves of this and related material through those channels.

Sincerely yours,

ABRAM CHAYES,  
The Legal Adviser.

MR. CHARLES FOSTER'S LETTER IN REPLY  
FEBRUARY 15, 1963.

Mr. ABRAM CHAYES,  
The Legal Adviser, Department of State,  
Washington 25, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAYES: I greatly appreciate your letter of February 5, but I find myself puzzled about a number of points you mention with regard to the private publication and copyrighting of Secretary Rusk's official speeches in an officially prepared book entitled "The Winds of Freedom."

You state that "The Department of State authorized Beacon Press" to publish the book in question. By what statutory authority does the Department have the right to do this? So far as I know no such authority exists in law. Indeed the only statute relating to private publication of official documents, the Copyright Act, expressly forbids copyrighting of such material. Section 8 of this law states: "No copyright shall subsist in any publication of the U.S. Govern-



ment, or any reprint, in whole or in part thereof" (17 U.S.C. 8).

Moreover, according to an official statement by the Copyright Office, "Any work produced by a Government employee within the scope of his employment is not copyrightable, even though produced by a private publisher" (Report of the Register of Copyrights to the House Committee on the Judiciary, 87th Cong., 1st sess., 1961, p. 131).

It will interest you to know that in opposing extension of copyrights, Deputy Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach, recently defined copyrights as "forms of monopolies" which should be restricted "from the viewpoint of the public."

You state that private publication was authorized by the State Department "in order to obtain a more widespread public awareness of the foreign policy positions of the U.S. Government." I fail to see how this can possibly be attained through the means authorized by your agency.

As you know, the book in question is being privately sold, under authorization of the State Department, at \$4.95 a copy. However, I understand that the same material, if issued by the Government Printing Office, as it should have been, could be made available to the public at about 60 cents a copy.

I note that advertisements promoting the private sale of the book refer to it as "indispensable for understanding the position of the Kennedy administration on intricate world problems and for its perceptive, carefully articulated analysis of the nature of the world struggle." If it is indeed so indispensable it should be available to my students—as well as to everyone else—at the low prices charged by the Government Printing Office for official publications, not at the high prices private publishers charge for commercial works.

You state that private publication of Secretary Rusk's speeches was motivated by "public service." I fail to see what public service is rendered when a compilation of official documents is furnished to a preferred publisher for copyrighted publication at \$4.95 a copy when it could have been made accessible to the public, without copyright restrictions, at 60 cents a copy.

You state that private publication of the book was "authorized" in order to obtain a more widespread public awareness of the foreign policy positions of the U.S. Government than would normally be available through use of the Government Printing Office." In view of what you imply in this regard permit me to call your attention to the following:

(a) The Government Printing Office was established by Congress and is supported by the taxpayer for the very purpose the State Department has disregarded—printing and distribution of official publications appropriately and inexpensively.

(b) It is a matter of record—and, I might add, considerable pride—that some publications of the Office have achieved circulations of several hundreds of thousands via purchase at low cost by the public in general.

(c) The resources of the Federal Government for promotion and publicity are far, far greater than those of any private publisher.

(d) In publicizing the publications of the Government Printing Office, the Superintendent of Documents distributes millions of promotional circulars every year. Incidentally, Government Printing Office publications are frequently the subject of publicity and reviews in leading newspapers and magazines.

You state that copyrighting of the work is due to "regrettable inadvertence." I fully agree that use of this restrictive device is "regrettable" but I find it difficult to believe that the Department did not know that it is quite customary for all private published material to be copyrighted. Nor can I persuade myself that the Department was un-

aware that publications of the Government Printing Office cannot be copyrighted.

Prior to joining the State Department's staff Mr. Ernest Lindley, Special Assistant to Secretary Rusk and editor of the book in question, was a prolific author of works published under copyright arrangements. As he must know, such arrangements are a basic requisite of all private publishing.

Moreover, I find "inadvertence" a very inadequate explanation in that it is common knowledge that other copyrighting of official material has been the subject of a great deal of attention in the press in the past few years. For specifics, permit me to call your attention to the criticisms set forth in last year's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as follows: July 18, 1962, page A5501, daily RECORD; October 11, 1962, pages A7590 and A7611, daily RECORD; also in volume 108, part 12, pages 16050-16052; volume 108, part 13, pages 17648-17649; volume 108, part 15, pages 20592-20593; and volume 108, part 17, page 22659.

It will interest you to know that "inadvertence" has been the explanation proffered when other glaring instances of copyrighting of official material have come to light. For details about one of the most important recent instances I refer you to a New York Times article of January 5, 1962, entitled "Copyright Erred on Kennedy Book."

You state that "at least the format of the material may be copyrighted, whatever else may not be." According to the Copyright Act and the Copyright Office the format in and of itself cannot be copyrighted. What can be copyrighted is genuine creativity and originality by a private individual. If there is any genuine creativity and originality in the book in question it is in the editing done by Mr. Lindley in his official capacity as Special Assistant to Secretary Rusk, but such work is not copyrightable because, as the Copyright Office has stated, "Any work produced by a Government employee within the scope of his employment is not copyrightable."

Incidentally, I understand that it is no secret in Washington that Mr. Lindley, a former Newsweek correspondent, is one of the State Department's ablest ghostwriters. I daresay that at least some of the speeches he wrote for Secretary Rusk are included in the book Mr. Lindley edited for the State Department as part of his official duties. I do not, of course, mean to imply any criticism of official ghostwriting; it's an unavoidable necessity in modern government. Secretary Rusk wouldn't have had much time for fulfilling his duties as the head of the State Department if he had to take time off to write all of the speeches appearing in the copyrighted book ascribed to his authorship.

You suggest that although the Secretary's speeches have been published under private copyright at \$4.95 a copy the official press releases in which they originally appeared are accessible to the public "through official channels of the Government"—meaning, I suppose, that every citizen is free to deprive himself of the right to obtain all of the speeches in conveniently compiled, indexed, and printed form unless he is willing to pay \$4.95 to a private publisher because the State Department has found it expedient to extend preferential treatment to that publisher instead of complying with the obligation of a Government agency to furnish the public with the full benefit of official work and official material through the proper official channels.

It will interest you to know that I originally became acquainted with the existence of "Winds of Freedom" when it was called to my attention by a friend. Despite the fact that its publication by Beacon Press was supposed to be a means of making it available to the public, it was not until the other day that I was finally able to obtain a copy. My previous efforts to locate the work in sev-

eral cities, including Washington, D.C., were fruitless. Moreover, although Beacon Press is the publishing house of the Unitarian denomination I have not found the book accessible, for examination or purchase, at any of the Unitarian churches I have visited.

Since, as the ads of the book state, it is "indispensable for understanding the position of the Kennedy administration on intricate world problems and for its perceptive, carefully articulated analysis of the nature of the world struggle", I take it that the State Department and its affiliated agencies have purchased many copies for official distribution. As a taxpayer I should like to know how many such copies have been paid for through public funds.

In conclusion, permit me to emphasize that although I hold Secretary Rusk in highest esteem, I feel I should speak up frankly and freely in this connection.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES R. FOSTER,  
Assistant Professor of Political Science,  
DePauw University.

#### CIVIL RIGHTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 75)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

"Our Constitution is colorblind," wrote Mr. Justice Harlan before the turn of the century, "and neither knows nor tolerates classes among citizens." But the practices of the country do not always conform to the principles of the Constitution. And this message is intended to examine how far we have come in achieving first-class citizenship for all citizens regardless of color, how far we have yet to go, and what further tasks remain to be carried out—by the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government, as well as by State and local governments and private citizens and organizations.

One hundred years ago the Emancipation Proclamation was signed by a President who believed in the equal worth and opportunity of every human being. That proclamation was only a first step—a step which its author unhappily did not live to follow up, a step which some of its critics dismissed as an action which "frees the slave but ignores the Negro." Through these long 100 years, while slavery has vanished, progress for the Negro has been too often blocked and delayed. Equality before the law has not always meant equal treatment and opportunity. And the harmful, wasteful and wrongful results of racial discrimination and segregation still appear in virtually every aspect of national life, in virtually every part of the Nation.

The Negro baby born in America today, regardless of the section or State in which he is born, has about one-half as much chance of completing high school as a white baby born in the same place on the same day; one-third as much chance of completing college; one-third as much chance of becoming a professional man; twice as much chance of becoming unemployed; about one-seventh as much chance of earning \$10,000 per

year; a life expectancy which is 7 years less; and the prospects of earning only half as much.

No American who believes in the basic truth that "all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights," can fully excuse, explain, or defend the picture these statistics portray. Race discrimination hampers our economic growth by preventing the maximum development and utilization of our manpower. It hampers our world leadership by contradicting at home the message we preach abroad. It mars the atmosphere of a united and classless society in which this Nation rose to greatness. It increases the costs of public welfare, crime, delinquency, and disorder. Above all, it is wrong.

Therefore, let it be clear, in our own hearts and minds, that it is not merely because of the cold war, and not merely because of the economic waste of discrimination, that we are committed to achieving true equality of opportunity. The basic reason is because it is right.

The cruel disease of discrimination knows no sectional or State boundaries. The continuing attack on this problem must be equally broad. It must be both private and public—it must be conducted at National, State, and local levels—and it must include both legislative and executive action.

In the last 2 years, more progress has been made in securing the civil rights of all Americans than in any comparable period in our history. Progress has been made—through executive action, litigation, persuasion, and private initiative—in achieving and protecting equality of opportunity in education, voting, transportation, employment, housing, government, and the enjoyment of public accommodations.

But pride in our progress must not give way to relaxation of our effort. Nor does progress in the executive branch enable the legislative branch to escape its own obligations. On the contrary, it is in the light of this nationwide progress, and in the belief that Congress will wish once again to meet its responsibilities in this matter, that I stress in the following agenda of existing and prospective action important legislative as well as administrative measures.

#### I. THE RIGHT TO VOTE

The right to vote in a free American election is the most powerful and precious right in the world—and it must not be denied on the grounds of race or color. It is a potent key to achieving other rights of citizenship. For American history, both recent and past, clearly reveals that the power of the ballot has enabled those who achieve it to win other achievements as well, to gain a full voice in the affairs of their State and Nation, and to see their interests represented in the governmental bodies which affect their future. In a free society, those with the power to govern are necessarily responsive to those with the right to vote.

In enacting the 1957 and 1960 Civil Rights Acts, Congress provided the De-

partment of Justice with basic tools for protecting the right to vote—and this administration has not hesitated to use those tools. Legal action is brought only after voluntary efforts fail—and, in scores of instances, local officials, at the request of the Department of Justice, have voluntarily made voting records available or abandoned discriminatory registration, discriminatory voting practices or segregated balloting. Where voluntary local compliance has not been forthcoming, the Department of Justice has approximately quadrupled the previous level of its legal effort—investigating coercion, inspecting records, initiating lawsuits, enjoining intimidation, and taking whatever followup action is necessary to forbid further interference or discrimination. As a result, thousands of Negro citizens are registering and voting for the first time—many of them in counties where no Negro had ever voted before. The Department of Justice will continue to take whatever action is required to secure the right to vote for all Americans.

Experience has shown, however, that these highly useful acts of the 85th and 86th Congresses suffer from two major defects. One is the usual long and difficult delay which occurs between the filing of a lawsuit and its ultimate conclusion. In one recent case, for example, 19 months elapsed between the filing of the suit and the judgment of the court. In another, an action brought in July 1961 has not yet come to trial. The legal maxim "justice delayed is justice denied" is dramatically applicable in these cases.

Too often those who attempt to assert their constitutional rights are intimidated. Prospective registrants are fired. Registration workers are arrested. In some instances, churches in which registration meetings are held have been burned. In one case where Negro tenant farmers chose to exercise their right to vote, it was necessary for the Justice Department to seek injunctions to halt their eviction and for the Department of Agriculture to help feed them from surplus stocks. Under these circumstances, continued delay in the granting of the franchise, particularly in counties where there is mass racial disfranchisement, permits the intent of the Congress to be openly flouted.

Federal executive action in such cases, no matter how speedy and how drastic, can never fully correct such abuses of power. It is necessary instead to free the forces of our democratic system within these areas by promptly insuring the franchise to all citizens, making it possible for their elected officials to be truly responsive to all their constituents.

The second and somewhat overlapping gap in these statutes is their failure to deal specifically with the most common forms of abuse of discretion on the part of local election officials who do not treat all applicants uniformly.

Objections were raised last year to the proposed literacy test bill, which attempted to speed up the enforcement of

the right to vote by removing one important area of discretion from registration officials who used that discretion to exclude Negroes. Preventing that bill from coming to a vote did not make any less real the prevalence in many counties of the use of literacy and other voter qualification tests to discriminate against prospective Negro voters, contrary to the requirements of the 14th and 15th amendments, and adding to the delays and difficulties encountered in securing the franchise for those denied it.

An indication of the magnitude of the overall problem, as well as the need for speedy action, is a recent five-State survey disclosing over 200 counties in which fewer than 15 percent of the Negroes of voting age are registered to vote. This cannot continue. I am, therefore, recommending legislation to deal with this problem of judicial delay and administrative abuse in four ways:

First, to provide for interim relief while voting suits are proceeding through the courts in areas of demonstrated need, temporary Federal voting referees should be appointed to determine the qualifications of applicants for registration and voting during the pendency of a lawsuit in any county in which fewer than 15 percent of the eligible number of persons of any race claimed to be discriminated against are registered to vote. Existing Federal law provides for the appointment of voting referees to receive and act upon applications for voting registration upon a court finding that a pattern or practice of discrimination exists. But to prevent a successful case from becoming an empty victory, insofar as the particular election is concerned, the proposed legislation would provide that, within these prescribed limits, temporary voting referees would be appointed to serve from the inception to the conclusion of the Federal voting suit, applying, however, only State law and State regulations. As officers of the court, their decisions would be subject to court scrutiny and review.

Second, voting suits brought under the Federal civil rights statutes should be accorded expedited treatment in the Federal courts, just as in many State courts election suits are given preference on the dockets on the sensible premise that, unless the right to vote can be exercised at a specific election, it is, to the extent of that election, lost forever.

Third, the law should specifically prohibit the application of different tests, standards, practices, or procedures for different applicants seeking to register and vote in Federal elections. Under present law, the courts can ultimately deal with the various forms of racial discrimination practiced by local registrars. But the task of litigation, and the time consumed in preparation and proof, should be lightened in every possible fashion. No one can rightfully contend that any voting registrar should be permitted to deny the vote to any qualified citizen, anywhere in this country,



through discriminatory administration of qualifying tests, or upon the basis of minor errors in filling out a complicated form which seeks only information. Yet the Civil Rights Commission, and the cases brought by the Department of Justice, have compiled one discouraging example after another of obstacles placed in the path of Negroes seeking to register to vote at the same time that other applicants experience no difficulty whatsoever. Qualified Negroes, including those with college degrees, have been denied registration for their inability to give a reasonable interpretation of the Constitution. They have been required to complete their applications with unreasonable precision, or to secure registered voters to vouch for their identity, or to defer to white persons who want to register ahead of them, or they are otherwise subjected to exasperating delays. Yet uniformity of treatment is required by the dictates of both the Constitution and fairplay—and this proposed statute, therefore, seeks to spell out that principle to ease the difficulties and delays of litigation. Limiting the proposal to voting qualifications in elections for Federal offices alone will clearly eliminate any constitutional conflict.

Fourth, completion of the sixth grade should, with respect to Federal elections, constitute a presumption that the applicant is literate. Literacy tests pose especially difficult problems in determining voter qualification. The essentially subjective judgment involved in each individual case, and the difficulty of challenging that judgment, have made literacy tests one of the cruelest and most abused of all voter qualification tests. The incidence of such abuse can be eliminated, or at least drastically curtailed, by the proposed legislation providing that proof of completion of the sixth grade constitutes a presumption that the applicant is literate.

Finally, the 87th Congress, after 20 years of effort, passed and referred to the States for ratification a constitutional amendment to prohibit the levying of poll taxes as a condition to voting. Already 13 States have ratified the proposed amendment and in 3 more 1 body of the legislature has acted. I urge every State legislature to take prompt action on this matter and to outlaw the poll tax—which has too long been an outmoded and arbitrary bar to voting participation by minority groups and others—as the 24th amendment to the Constitution. This measure received bipartisan sponsorship and endorsement in the Congress—and I shall continue to work with Governors and legislative leaders of both parties in securing adoption of the anti-poll-tax amendment.

## II. EDUCATION

Nearly 9 years have elapsed since the Supreme Court ruled that State laws requiring or permitting segregated schools violate the Constitution. That decision represented both good law and good judgment—it was both legally and morally right. Since that time it has

become increasingly clear that neither violence nor legalistic evasions will be tolerated as a means of thwarting court-ordered desegregation, that closed schools are not an answer, and that responsible communities are able to handle the desegregation process in a calm and sensible manner. This is as it should be, for, as I stated to the Nation at the time of the Mississippi violence last September:

"Our Nation is founded on the principle that observance of the law is the eternal safeguard of liberty, and defiance of the law is the surest road to tyranny. The law which we obey includes the final rulings of the courts, as well as the enactments of our legislative bodies. Even among law-abiding men, few laws are universally loved—but they are uniformly respected and not resisted.

"Americans are free to disagree with the law but not to disobey it. For in a government of laws and not of men, no man, however prominent or powerful, and no mob, however unruly or boisterous, is entitled to defy a court of law. If this country should ever reach the point where any man or group of men, by force or threat of force, could long defy the commands of our courts and our Constitution, then no law would stand free from doubt, no judge would be sure of his writ, and no citizen would be safe from his neighbors."

The shameful violence which accompanied but did not prevent the end of segregation at the University of Mississippi was an exception. State-supported universities in Georgia and South Carolina met this test in recent years with calm and maturity, as did the State-supported universities of Virginia, North Carolina, Florida, Texas, Louisiana, Tennessee, Arkansas, and Kentucky in earlier years. In addition, progress toward the desegregation of education at all levels has made other notable and peaceful strides, including the following forward moves in the last 2 years alone:

Desegregation plans have been put into effect peacefully in the public schools of Atlanta, Dallas, New Orleans, Memphis, and elsewhere, with over 60 school districts desegregated last year—frequently with the help of Federal persuasion and consultation, and in every case without incident or disorder.

Teacher training institutes financed under the National Defense Education Act are no longer held in colleges which refuse to accept students without regard to race, and this has resulted in a number of institutions opening their doors to Negro applicants voluntarily.

The same is now true of Institutes conducted by the National Science Foundation.

Beginning in September of this year, under the aid to impacted area school program, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will initiate a program of providing on-base facilities so that children living on military installations will no longer be required to attend segregated schools at Federal expense. These children should not be vic-

timized by segregation merely because their fathers chose to serve in the Armed Forces and were assigned to an area where schools are operated on a segregated basis.

In addition, the Department of Justice and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have succeeded in obtaining voluntary desegregation in many other districts receiving impacted area school assistance; and, representing the Federal interest, have filed lawsuits to end segregation in a number of other districts.

The Department of Justice has also intervened to seek the opening of public schools in the case of Prince Edward County, Va., the only county in the Nation where there are no public schools, and where a bitter effort to thwart court decrees requiring desegregation has caused nearly 1,500 out of 1,800 school-age Negro children to go without any education for more than 3 years.

In these and other areas within its jurisdiction, the executive branch will continue its efforts to fulfill the constitutional objective of an equal, nonsegregated, educational opportunity for all children.

Despite these efforts, however, progress toward primary and secondary school desegregation has still been too slow, often painfully so. Those children who are being denied their constitutional rights are suffering a loss which can never be regained, and which will leave scars which can never be fully healed. I have in the past expressed my belief that the full authority of the Federal Government should be placed behind the achievement of school desegregation, in accordance with the command of the Constitution. One obvious area of Federal action is to help facilitate the transition to desegregation in those areas which are conforming or wish to conform their practices to the law.

Many of these communities lack the resources necessary to eliminate segregation in their public schools while at the same time assuring that educational standards will be maintained and improved. The problem has been compounded by the fact that the climate of mistrust in many communities has left many school officials with no qualified source to turn to for information and advice.

There is a need for technical assistance by the Office of Education to assist local communities in preparing and carrying out desegregation plans, including the supplying of information on means which have been employed to desegregate other schools successfully. There is also need for financial assistance to enable those communities which desire and need such assistance to employ specialized personnel to cope with problems occasioned by desegregation and to train school personnel to facilitate the transition to desegregation. While some facilities for providing this

kind of assistance are presently available in the Office of Education, they are not adequate to the task.

I recommend, therefore, a program of Federal technical and financial assistance to aid school districts in the process of desegregation in compliance with the Constitution.

Finally, it is obvious that the unconstitutional and outmoded concept of "separate but equal" does not belong in the Federal statute books. This is particularly true with respect to higher education, where peaceful desegregation has been underway in practically every State for some time. I repeat, therefore, this administration's recommendation of last year that this phrase be eliminated from the Morrill Land Grant College Act.

### III. EXTENSION AND EXPANSION OF THE COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

The Commission on Civil Rights, established by the Civil Rights Act of 1957, has been in operation for more than 5 years and is scheduled to expire on November 30, 1963. During this time it has fulfilled its statutory mandate by investigating deprivations of the right to vote and denials of equal protection of the laws in education, employment, housing, and the administration of justice. The Commission's reports and recommendations have provided the basis for remedial action by both Congress and the executive branch.

There are, of course, many areas of denials of rights yet to be fully investigated. But the Commission is now in a position to provide even more useful service to the Nation. As more communities evidence a willingness to face frankly their problems of racial discrimination, there is an increasing need for expert guidance and assistance in devising workable programs for civil rights progress. Agencies of State and local government, industry, labor, and community organizations, when faced with problems of segregation and racial tensions, all can benefit from information about how these problems have been solved in the past. The opportunity to seek an experienced and sympathetic forum on a voluntary basis can often open channels of communication between contending parties and help bring about the conditions necessary for orderly progress. And the use of public hearings—to contribute to public knowledge of the requirements of the Constitution and national policy—can create in these communities the atmosphere of understanding which is indispensable to peaceful and permanent solution to racial problems.

The Federal Civil Rights Commission has the experience and capability to make a significant contribution toward achieving these objectives. It has advised the executive branch not only about desirable policy changes but about the administrative techniques needed to make these changes effective. If, however, the Commission is to perform these additional services effectively, changes in its authorizing statute are necessary

and it should be placed on a more stable and more permanent basis. A proposal that the Commission be made a permanent body would be a pessimistic prediction that our problems will never be solved. On the other hand, to let the experience and knowledge gathered by the Commission go to waste, by allowing it to expire, or by extending its life only for another 2 years with no change in responsibility, would ignore the very real contribution this agency can make toward meeting our racial problems. I recommend, therefore, that the Congress authorize the Civil Rights Commission to serve as a national civil rights clearinghouse providing information, advice, and technical assistance to any requesting agency, private or public; that in order to fulfill these new responsibilities, the Commission be authorized to concentrate its activities upon those problems within the scope of its statute which most need attention; and that the life of the Commission be extended for a term of at least 4 more years.

### IV. EMPLOYMENT

Racial discrimination in employment is especially injurious both to its victims and to the national economy. It results in a great waste of human resources and creates serious community problems. It is, moreover, inconsistent with the democratic principle that no man should be denied employment commensurate with his abilities because of his race or creed or ancestry.

The President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, reconstituted by Executive order in early 1961, has, under the leadership of the Vice President, taken significant steps to eliminate racial discrimination by those who do business with the Government. Hundreds of companies, covering 17 million jobs, have agreed to stringent nondiscriminatory provisions now standard in all Government contracts. One hundred and four industrial concerns, including most of the Nation's major employers, have in addition signed agreements calling for an affirmative attack on discrimination in employment; and 117 labor unions, representing about 85 percent of the membership of the AFL-CIO, have signed similar agreements with the Committee. Comprehensive compliance machinery has been instituted to enforce these agreements. The Committee has received over 1,300 complaints in 2 years, more than in the entire 7½ years of the Committee's prior existence, and has achieved corrective action on 72 percent of the cases handled—a heartening and unprecedented record. Significant results have been achieved in placing Negroes with contractors who previously employed whites only—and in the elevation of Negroes to a far higher proportion of professional, technical and supervisory jobs. Let me repeat my assurances that these provisions in Government contracts and the voluntary nondiscrimination agreements will be carefully monitored and strictly enforced.

In addition, the Federal Government, as an employer, has continued to pursue a policy of nondiscrimination in its employment and promotion programs. Negro high school and college graduates are now being intensively sought out and recruited. A policy of not distinguishing on grounds of race is not limited to the appointment of distinguished Negroes—although they have in fact been appointed to a record number of high policymaking, judicial, and administrative posts. There has also been a significant increase in the number of Negroes employed in the middle and upper grades of the career Federal service. In jobs paying \$4,500 to \$10,000 annually, for example, there was an increase of 26 percent in the number of Negroes during the year ending June 30, 1962, over three times the rate of increase for all employees in those grades during the year. Career civil servants will continue to be employed and promoted on the basis of merit, and not color, in every agency of the Federal Government, including all regional and local offices.

This Government has also adopted a new executive policy with respect to the organization of its employees. As part of this policy, only those Federal employee labor organizations that do not discriminate on grounds of race or color will be recognized.

Outside of Government employment, the National Labor Relations Board is now considering cases involving charges of racial discrimination against a number of union locals. I have directed the Department of Justice to participate in these cases and to urge the National Labor Relations Board to take appropriate action against racial discrimination in unions. It is my hope that administrative action and litigation will make unnecessary the enactment of legislation with respect to union discrimination.

### V. PUBLIC ACCOMMODATIONS

No act is more contrary to the spirit of our democracy and Constitution—or more rightfully resented by a Negro citizen who seeks only equal treatment—than the barring of that citizen from restaurants, hotels, theaters, recreational areas, and other public accommodations and facilities.

Wherever possible, this administration has dealt sternly with such acts. In 1961, the Justice Department and the Interstate Commerce Commission successfully took action to bring an end to discrimination in rail and bus facilities. In 1962, the 15 airports still maintaining segregated facilities were persuaded to change their practices, 13 voluntarily and 2 others after the Department of Justice brought legal action. As a result of these steps, systematic segregation in interstate transportation has virtually ceased to exist. No doubt isolated instances of discrimination in transportation terminals, restaurants, restrooms, and other facilities will continue to crop up, but any such discrimination will be dealt with promptly.



In addition, restaurants and public facilities in buildings leased by the Federal Government have been opened up to all Federal employees in areas where previously they had been segregated. The General Services Administration no longer contracts for the lease of space in office buildings unless such facilities are available to all Federal employees without regard to race. This move has taken place without fanfare and practically without incident; and full equality of facilities will continue to be made available to all Federal employees in every State.

National parks, forests and other recreation areas, and the District of Columbia Stadium, are open to all without regard to race. Meetings sponsored by the Federal Government or addressed by Federal appointees are held in hotels and halls which do not practice discrimination or segregation. The Department of Justice has asked the Supreme Court to reverse the convictions of Negroes arrested for seeking to use public accommodations; and took action both through the courts and the use of Federal marshals to protect those who were testing the desegregation of transportation facilities.

In these and other ways, the Federal Government will continue to encourage and support action by State and local communities, and by private entrepreneurs, to assure all members of the public equal access to all public accommodations. A country with a "color blind" Constitution, and with no castes or classes among its citizens, cannot afford to do less.

#### VI. OTHER USES OF FEDERAL FUNDS

The basic standard of nondiscrimination, which I earlier stated has now been applied by the executive branch to every area of its activity—affects other programs not listed above:

Although President Truman ordered the armed services of this country desegregated in 1948, it was necessary in 1962 to bar segregation formally and specifically in the Army and Air Force Reserves and in the training of all civil defense workers.

A new Executive order on housing, as unanimously recommended by the Civil Rights Commission in 1959, prohibits discrimination in the sale, lease, or use of housing owned or constructed in the future by the Federal Government or guaranteed under the FHA, VA, and Farmers Home Administration program. With regard to existing property owned or financed through the Federal Government, the departments and agencies are directed to take every appropriate action to promote the termination of discriminatory practices that may exist. A President's Committee on Equal Housing Opportunity was created by the order to implement its provisions.

A Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces has been established to investigate and make recommendations regarding the treatment of minority groups, with special emphasis on off-base problems.

The U.S. Coast Guard Academy now has Negro students for the first time in its 87 years of existence.

The Department of Justice has increased its prosecution of police brutality cases, many of them in Northern States, and is assisting State and local police departments in meeting this problem.

State employee merit systems operating programs financed with Federal funds are now prohibited from discriminating on the basis of race or color.

The Justice Department is challenging the constitutionality of the separate but equal provisions which permit hospitals constructed with Federal funds to discriminate racially in the location of patients and the acceptance of doctors.

In short, the executive branch of the Federal Government, under this administration and in all of its activities, now stands squarely behind the principle of equal opportunity, without segregation or discrimination, in the employment of Federal funds, facilities, and personnel. All officials at every level are charged with the responsibility of implementing this principle and a formal interdepartmental action group, under White House chairmanship, oversees this effort and follows through on each directive. For the first time, the full force of Federal executive authority is being exerted in the battle against race discrimination.

#### CONCLUSION

The various steps which have been undertaken or which are proposed in this message do not constitute a final answer to the problems of race discrimination in this country. They do constitute a list of priorities—steps which can be taken by the executive branch and measures which can be enacted by the 88th Congress. Other measures directed toward these same goals will be favorably commented on and supported, as they have in the past—and they will be signed, if enacted into law.

In addition, it is my hope that this message will lend encouragement to those State and local governments—and to private organizations, corporations, and individuals—who share my concern over the gap between our precepts and our practices. This is an effort in which every individual who asks what he can do for his country should be able and willing to take part. It is important, for example, for private citizens and local governments to support the State Department's effort to end the discriminatory treatment suffered by too many foreign diplomats, students, and visitors to this country. But it is not enough to treat those from other lands with equality and dignity—the same treatment must be afforded to every American citizen.

The program outlined in this message should not provide the occasion for sectional bitterness. No State or section of this Nation can pretend a self-righteous role, for every area has its own civil rights problems.

Nor should the basic elements of this program be imperiled by partisanship. The proposals put forth are consistent

with the platforms of both parties and with the positions of their leaders. Inevitably there will be disagreement about means and strategy. But I would hope that on issues of constitutional rights and freedom, as in matters affecting our national security, there is a fundamental unity among us that will survive partisan debate over particular issues.

The centennial of the issuance of the Emancipation Proclamation is an occasion for celebration, for a sober assessment of our failures, and for rededication to the goals of freedom. Surely there could be no more meaningful observance of the centennial than the enactment of effective civil rights legislation and the continuation of effective executive action.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 28, 1963.

#### CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the level attained by a democratic civilization is revealed in important part by the state of those rights which protect the citizenry from oppressive action.

Many of our civil rights were wrung from past governments by our ancestors.

Mr. Speaker, precious indeed is the American right to vote. This is the well-spring of opportunity in our society. Yet, as long as any American is denied the right to vote because of race or color, our civilization will not attain full development.

The President's message on civil rights, received today by the Congress, sets forth several practical proposals in this important area and in other areas of civil rights.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I think it should be pointed out at this time, that the many Executive actions taken in the last 2 years in the area of civil rights have been important contributions. I applaud the President for his many Executive achievements. No other administration in our times has a comparable record in this important area.

#### CIVIL RIGHTS OR CIVIL WRONGS

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe the constitutional rights of all Americans should be guaranteed and protected. I am afraid, however, that the question of civil rights has become such a political football that what is developing is a set of civil wrongs practiced on the majority in the zeal to win the votes of minorities. We cannot

guarantee civil rights to minorities by riding roughshod over the Constitution, by setting race against race, by throwing States rights out the window, and dispensing with all traditions of a system under which all people of every race, color and creed have made greater advances than in any other country in the world.

There are none who will deny the Negro has suffered abuses. There are none so base as to deplore the excesses which have occurred, but why is it so necessary for the Kennedy administration in trying to prove its every point to downgrade the United States? Nowhere in the President's message does he recognize the progress the Negro has made in America. He does not point out how far we have moved ahead in opening up new educational opportunities, new employment opportunities. He ignores the many fine neighborhoods everywhere in this Nation where people of many races who have the initiative and the willingness to sacrifice and build have created beautiful homes and enjoy the best of living conditions. This is not to say we should not constantly strive to do better, to maintain a national climate which affords greater opportunity for all our people.

We will not create this climate, we will not really help the Negro through force, through the use of Federal troops, through thought control, through court edicts. The Negro can only suffer setbacks in the progress he is steadily making if we continue to make a political football of civil rights. Unless we protect the civil rights of all Americans, not just the minorities, we cannot guarantee the civil rights of any group.

Just for a moment let us consider some aspects the President conveniently overlooks. There is a constant cry for more Federal jobs for Negroes. Yet, what are the facts? The latest available figures I have been able to secure are from the Department of Labor, Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. This report shows Negroes in the Federal service make up 13 percent of the total working force. The Post Office Department had 15 percent, Veterans' Administration, 19 percent, and General Services Administration, 16 percent. Negroes represent about 10 percent of the population of the United States. Certainly no one can claim they are being discriminated against in Federal employment, where we find competent Negroes in jobs at every level of government.

The South has been made the whipping boy of the civil rights question and completely ignored are the great strides made in the improvement of the lot of the Negro in the South. Those liberals who scream loudest for integration and complete civil rights in the South will have no part of it in the North. Minor racial incidents in the South are banner headlines in newspapers throughout the world, but there is a strange silence over major race riots in Chicago, New York, and here in Washington, D.C., on last Thanksgiving Day. And what of the segregation practices of many of the labor unions who will deny acceptance of

the Negro in their organization, but will demand that all the rest of society accept him?

Negro leaders, too, must alter their thinking if they truly believe in the cause of improving conditions for their race. In the millions of words in the newspapers, magazines and over radio and TV, calling for more civil rights for the Negro, greater opportunity for the Negro, better homes for the Negro, rare it is indeed for any prominent Negro leader to remind his fellows that with rights there is also responsibility. There must be some effort on the part of people to help themselves. People cannot move ahead by absolving themselves of all responsibility for every irresponsible action by claiming that all Negro lawlessness is caused by lack of job opportunity, lack of recreational facilities, lack of good homes. Granted that environment is a contributing cause to delinquency in many cases among all races, there are too many crimes committed by Negroes from good homes with good opportunities to make this a blanket excuse for every delinquent and criminal belonging to a minority.

We cannot call it civil rights when the President issues Executive orders, which in my opinion are unconstitutional, taking away the rights of the owners of private property by making it illegal for them to rent or sell to persons of their own choice in a free market.

Mr. Speaker, the best way we can help the Negro and all minority groups is for all of us to pull together to return this Nation to constitutional limited Government so that the people at the State and local level can settle many of the problems we now face. I am still of the firm belief that the good that is in the hearts and minds of most Americans will furnish the prescription for justice for all people if friends and neighbors can attack their problems without Federal interference and agitation by those who, for political gain or other reasons, find it advantageous to stir up unrest and racial tensions. Patience, courage, goodwill, a belief in the American dream and the ideals which inspired the founding of this great Nation will solve the problems for the minorities. Political pressure, the subverting of the Constitution in order to build a political dynasty, the appeal to racism in the mad quest for power can only slow the progress which is already being made in behalf of minorities.

While we are on the subject of civil rights, how about the civil rights of the millions of workers of this country who are being deprived of their rights by ruthless and autocratic labor leaders? How about the civil rights of the people of Cleveland and New York who have been denied their newspapers for months because of the action of a small group of labor leaders? How about the civil rights of hundreds of thousands of workers who were thrown off their jobs and other countless thousands of our citizens whose rights were ignored by the reckless action of the recent dock workers' strike? If we believe in civil

rights, let us be for civil rights all the way. As a part of these remarks I would like to include editorials by David Lawrence in the U.S. News & World Report:

#### ANARCHY

(By David Lawrence)

Moral decay in our political system is responsible for the anarchy that prevails today in labor-management relations.

We prate about civil rights. We send Federal troops to coerce a State university to admit a student. We file suits in the courts to make sure that certain citizens are not denied voting rights. But we shut our eyes when the whole governmental system is used to blackmail an employer into accepting the exorbitant demands of labor unions.

The longshoremen's strike was settled by Government intervention, but can it be said that "free" collective bargaining characterized the settlement?

The newspaper strikes in Cleveland and New York have been frowned upon by public opinion in both cities and in the Nation wherever the facts have been revealed. But the right of a dictator in one union—backed by other unions—to hold out until some of the employers are tottering on the edge of bankruptcy has not been challenged in the courts. No "inherent" powers are invoked by the Attorney General to sustain an employer's civil right—the opportunity to survive.

Isn't there a civil right which says that no citizen can conspire with another to destroy a man's business?

Isn't there a civil right which says that nobody can conspire with someone else to prevent another citizen from crossing a picket line either to take a job or to buy goods from a company involved in a strike?

Isn't there a civil right which says that a union having a bare majority of the employees in a bargaining unit has no right to represent other citizens who refuse to join such a union?

Isn't there a civil right which says that a man cannot be forced to accept the tenets of any church or organization or political party? So why must he be fired from his job because he will not join a union?

Isn't there a civil right which says that a citizen who is physically threatened or attacked in a labor dispute may obtain redress?

Yet, writing in the January 21 issue of this magazine, J. Mack Swigert, of Cincinnati, Ohio, one of the foremost authorities on labor law in the country, says:

"Labor-violence cases, when presented in police court, are customarily continued until the strike is over and then dismissed. The reluctance of many courts to issue and to enforce injunctions against unions is well known to lawyers.

"Police assigned to strike duty often look the other way when union violence occurs. Even the FBI is reluctant to intervene in labor disputes. Many States have statutes forbidding or limiting the use of State highway police in such disputes. A tendency to lean in the direction of the union when the question is a close one is observed throughout almost the entire hierarchy of public officials.

"Favorable treatment of unions is particularly marked in the case of State and Federal administrative officials and employees who deal directly with labor problems.

"State departments of labor, workmen's compensation commissions, unemployment commissions, industrial commissions, mediation boards, and labor boards are almost uniformly staffed with union members or former union officials or persons otherwise closely associated with and sympathetic to the union movement. This is true even



though these agencies are charged with the protection of all workers, including the great majority who are nonunion.

"Similarly, the U.S. Department of Labor, the National Labor Relations Board, and, to a considerable extent, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, as well as other agencies dealing with labor problems, are staffed largely with union members or sympathizers.

"Since the advent of the Kennedy administration, the National Labor Relations Board has openly moved in a direction very helpful to organized labor.

"The unions now have a clear majority of union sympathizers on the Board.

"During the past 2 years, under the leadership of the new Chairman of the Board, numerous precedents have been overruled and discarded, and the labor law has been substantially changed without legislation.

"Largely because of public sympathy and effective political action, unions not only benefit from favorable legislation, but also are singled out for special and favorable treatment from courts, arbitrators, law officers, and other public officials.

"As politicians make laws and enforce them, this idea that unions can influence the direction of thousands or even millions of votes leads politicians who want to keep their jobs or advance in their profession to bend in the union direction when a union issue is before them."

How can we shut our eyes to the true meaning of this indictment? On these issues, we seem to have experienced a moral deterioration as we drift into a state of anarchy in the national economy.

#### A BILL TO CREATE A JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today submitted a bill to create a Joint Committee on the Budget. We have discussed the possibility of such a joint committee in the past, but we have not acted. The time has come, however, when we can no longer ignore the pressing need for the greater cooperation and efficiency that would result from the work of such a group.

A Joint Committee on the Budget would consider the President's messages on the state of the Union and Economic Report, would inform itself on all matters relating to the annual budget of the agencies of our Government, and would report its findings to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees with recommendations that would expedite the handling of appropriations requests.

Thus far this session we have received a request from the President for appropriations in the next fiscal year in the amount of more than \$98 billion, the largest peacetime budget ever submitted. While we attempt to analyze this budget request, we must also consider the possible effects of proposed tax cuts and reforms. The Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate must

each wade through volumes of information, often duplicating activities, and resulting in needless delays.

Last year's budget message predicted a surplus of \$500 million by the reasoning that revenues would exceed expenditures. It is now conceded that when June rolls around we will have a deficit of at least \$8 or \$9 billion. This represents an error in judgment comparable to 10 percent of the total expenditures of the Government for the year. This clearly indicates the need for further checking, evaluation, examination, and closer cooperation between the two Houses of Congress.

With the complexities and size of modern-day budgets, the American people expect and should get the most efficient evaluations and considerations possible when we appropriate their money.

A Joint Committee on the Budget would greatly improve the surveillance over the expenditures of public funds and would be a positive step toward the elimination of extravagance, waste, and needless or excessive appropriations.

We need harmony and cooperation between the respective Appropriations Committees of the two Houses of Congress. This bill would provide a climate conducive to such cooperation. It is only reasonable that we all will benefit when the two groups work together, get the same information, to enable them to more intelligently evaluate the many requests before them.

We already have a precedent for such a joint committee. The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation has been in operation for a number of years and has demonstrated how much efficiency can be effected through cooperation.

These same efficiencies can be effected in the area of the budget, and I respectfully urge the adoption of this measure to bring such a joint committee into being.

#### BULGARIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 3d, it will have been 83 years since the Bulgarian people received their independence from the imperial Russian Government and the Ottoman Empire; ending a 500-year struggle.

Bulgarian liberation followed the self-sacrificing struggle led by such patriots as George Rakovski, Vasil Levski, and Christo Botev and was preceded by a national uprising which won the sympathy of the world.

The liberation of Bulgaria was followed by the election of a freely elected national assembly which adopted the

Tirnov Constitution, one of the great liberal doctrines of all times.

Ignored by the present Communist regime, the constitution has always been the rallying point for democratic forces opposing communism in Bulgaria.

The Bulgarian people, Mr. Speaker, have remarkably demonstrated what can be done in a free country.

September 8, 1944 was a sad day for freedom loving people throughout the world. Bulgaria was invaded by Russian armies and the Bulgarian democratic government coalition of the National Agrarian Union and the democratic party was overthrown. A Communist controlled government was established and Bulgaria became another satellite to Communist Russia.

The story since that time has been the usual tragic one. We can only hope as we reflect upon the misery that ensnarls Communist Bulgaria today, that the great and unconquerable will that the Bulgarian people have demonstrated in the past will reassert itself, and freedom will again encompass the country.

#### CUBAN CAVES

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the presence of a Soviet bloc satellite 90 miles off our shores is sufficient cause for alarm from the standpoint of its possible use as a base for subversion. Given the attitudes of Fidel Castro and his Communist friends, it would be imprudent to think otherwise. By the same token, we cannot overlook the possibility of Castro's Soviet and Chinese Communist allies using Cuba for similar purposes.

However, the presence of intermediate range missiles capable of delivering either a nuclear or chemical attack upon the United States would pose an even graver problem for this Nation—one requiring steel nerves and costly countermeasures.

#### FORTY-SIX MISSILES IN CUBA?

The U.S. News & World Report of February 4, 1963, has an item on page 38 entitled "Eyewitness: '46 Medium-Range Missiles Still on the Island.'" According to this item, the Soviets originally sent 88 medium-range missiles to Cuba, of which only 42 were withdrawn last fall. The complete item is as follows:

An authoritative source who has just left Cuba reported this:

My people counted 88 medium-range Soviet missiles in Cuba, of which only 42 were taken out, by Russian count. That leaves 46 missiles still on the island.

There are 10,000 Russian troops and 12,000 non-Russian Communists in "international brigades."

Why did the United States stop its pressure after the week of confrontation over missiles?

On the Saturday night before the agreement with Russia, October 27, 1962, there was panic in the upper circles of the Castro government.

Officials were running for cover. They were quietly asking diplomats for asylum, trying to get into embassies. They were trying to get places for themselves and families on ships leaving Havana.

Now that the United States has permitted Castro to demobilize, morale has gone back up. My judgment is that the winners of the showdown in October were the Russians and Castro, and that the loser was the United States.

The average Cuban now says, "I hate the Communists, but I also hate the United States." His hatred is for being let down twice, in the invasion at the Bay of Pigs, and last October.

The economy and administration of Cuba are a catastrophe. Housing projects are falling apart. There are no new shoes. But the police state and the Communist military forces make an uprising from the inside impossible.

I have no knowledge as to the accuracy of the above item. However, if there are in fact 46 missiles left in Cuba, they have to be somewhere. Caves are the most likely storage area, barring the possibility of a form of camouflage not yet detectable by our current air surveillance techniques.

#### LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE REPORT

So far as I know, little information has been published recently about the size and number of caves in Cuba. On February 7, 1963, I asked the Legislative Reference Service to search the Library of Congress for references to Cuban caves. On February 19, 1963, I received the following reply:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,

Washington, D.C., February 19, 1963.

To: HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND.

From: Natural Resources Division.

Subject: Number and sizes of the caves in Cuba.

Response is made to your inquiry of February 7, 1963 relative to caves in Cuba.

Inquiry was made of the Geological Survey concerning caves in Cuba. The Survey indicated it had no specific knowledge as to the number and sizes of the caves. However, they reported that Dr. Charles Park, Jr., Dean, Earth Sciences, University of Stanford, Stanford, Calif., might have information, since he carried out a limestone study in Cuba.

A search was made of material available in the Library of Congress. This search did not reveal any recently published material indicating the number and sizes of the caves in Cuba. However, materials are available which discuss various aspects of caves found in Cuba. The source of listed articles in Spanish is the "Handbook of Latin American Studies," volumes 14-24, 1948-62. The following pertinent materials are enclosed:

"A Guide to the Cave of Bellamar," E. Guiteras. A travelogue of the cave is presented.

"Caves in World History," National Speleological Society; Bulletin No. 5, October 1943, page 11. Caves in Cuba and locations.

Eigenmann, Carl H. "Cave Vertebrates of America." Washington, D.C., 1909, pages 188-201. References to caves in Cuba.

"The Idol of the Cave," M. R. Harrington. Natural history, vol. 60, No. 7. September

1951, pages 313-318, 335. Account of exploration of a cave at La Patana Cabo Maisi Cuba.

"La Espeleología en Cuba," JNAE/R. Junio 1960, pages 39-103. Summary of cave explorations. Greater portion devoted to role of caves and of speleology in the recent revolution.

"La Caverna del sol," Antonio Munez Jimenez. INRA, 2:3, Marzo 1961, pages 58-67. Pictographs from the Cueva de Garcia Robion in Havana province—location is secret—military installation.

In addition you may wish to refer at some later date to the following magazine articles which are currently in the bindery and consequently not immediately available.

"El archipelago de las," Cavernas. INR, 1:5, Mayo 1960, pages 46-55. Discusses painted pictographs on the roof of the Cueva de la Isla, Punta del Este, Isla de Pinos; also Cueva de Ramos in Punta de Caguano, north of Las Villas.

The following is a listing of articles reportedly relating to caves in Cuba but which are not a part of the permanent collections of the Library of Congress.

Alvarez Conde, Jose:

Las cavernas funerarias de Cayo. "La Agriada." Habana, 1952, 34 pages. Account of discovery of burial caves off north coast of Cuba.

"Fomento: nuevo centro de hallazgos arqueológicos indígenas." Tremestre, volume 3, No. 2. Abril-Junio, pages 209-226. Cave burial in central Cuba.

"Revisión indo-arqueológica de la provincia de Las Villas." Habana, Junta Nacional de Arqueología y Etnología, 1961, 175 pages. Detailed summary of the sites and excavations in Las Villas Province, municipality. Includes hitherto unpublished work by the author.

Herrera Fritot, Rene and Manuel Rivero de la Calle. "La cueva funeraria de Carbonera, Matanzas." Contribucion de la sociedad Espeleologica de Cuba al Decimo Congreso Nacional de Historia. Habana, 1954, 45 pages. Excavations of a Ciboney cave on the north coast of Cuba in 1950.

"Rivera de la Calle," Manuel and Antonio Munez Jimenez. Excursiones arqueológicas a Camaguey (Santa Clara), Cuba. Universidad Central de las Villas. Departamentos de Investigaciones Antropológicas e Investigaciones Geográficas, 1958, 62 pages. Visit to a cave in Cerro de Tubaquey and to a village site in the Lomas de Guanay both in north central Cuba.

ERNEST PAPPAJOHN.

As may be seen from the foregoing, there are a number of references to Cuban caves in the Library of Congress material. In addition, I have written to Dr. Charles Park, Jr., dean of earth sciences, University of Stanford, asking him for any information he may have available on this subject.

One of the references I found very interesting in the Library of Congress compendium was a booklet entitled "Guide to the Cave of Bellamar" by Senor Eusebio Guiteras, published in 1863. This cave is located 1 mile from the Bridge of Ballen on the San Juan River near Mantanzas Bay.

Senor Guiteras describes one portion of the cave called the Galleries of the Fountains as being "2,400 feet long." It runs from "west to east, the greatest depth is 360 feet, the ground is dry, and the temperature is 80° F."

Unfortunately, the overall dimensions of the vault are not given. He goes on to say, "In principal places there are fixed

lights; good paths have been opened, bridges thrown over and steps placed wherever the passage required it."

Although few measurements are given in the booklet, an unmistakable impression of hugeness is given. For example, the first hall in the cave is called the Gothic Temple. There are several others having names equally suggesting spaciousness.

Another very interesting reference to caves in Cuba appears in a book, "Cave Vertebrates of America," by Prof. Carl H. Eigenmann, professor of zoology, Indiana University. It was published in June 1909 by the Carnegie Institute of Washington, D.C. On page 189 of this work there is a diagram of the Cave of the Insurrectos, which looks rather large indeed. On page 192 Professor Eigenmann describes the Caves of Cañas in these terms:

The caves about Cañas differ from those of the Carbonera and Alacranes. They are cistern-shaped sink-holes rather than caves in the ordinary sense of the word, but on account of the absence of soil there are no funnel-like depressions on the surface to indicate their presence. There is absolutely no general surface indication that one is in a cave country in traveling through it, and it is not until standing at the very brink of one that the presence of a cave may be suspected.

The magazine, INRA, of March 1961 has an article on "The Cave of the Sun," on page 59 with illustrations. These illustrations show possible storage for large weapons of war.

The letter I received from the Legislative Reference Service indicated that the U.S. Geological Survey has little or no information concerning caves in Cuba. The Geological Survey is a fine service and this fact in no way reflects discredit upon it.

In retrospect, it seems obvious we should have collected information concerning Cuban caves. For over 50 years prior to the Castro takeover, we had the freedom to acquire this information.

All of this suggests that our information-gathering programs in the past have sometimes lacked selectivity and impetus.

#### WHAT INFORMATION IS NEEDED?

Knowing what information to gather is a difficult problem. I am sure this Government has improved its information-gathering techniques since World War II. However, can anyone ever be certain as to just what will be needed in the future. I found an illustrative example of this problem in Col. Maurice Buckmaster's book "They Fought Alone." It is an example drawn from British experience at the outset of World War II. Colonel Buckmaster was charged with forming a secret British service called SOE with the mission of sabotaging French factories. The following passages show how difficult it is to foresee information needs:

On reflection, it seemed to me that the best thing I could do was to try and remember what I could about French factories which I had visited when I was working, during 1932 to 1936, for the Ford Co. of France. My information might be out of



date, but at least it was information. I drew a pile of typing paper toward me.

Day after day, for 3 weeks, I dredged my brain for knowledge, noting down every conceivable thing I could about the potential, the staff and the layout of French industry. In spite of my hard work, however, I could not conceal from myself the haphazard and incomplete nature of my notes. There was no system, save a vague geographical ordering from north to south. If only there were an alphabetical list.

"The 'Bottin'," I said, aloud. "Of course, the 'Bottin'." It was exactly what I had been looking for—an alphabetic thesaurus of French industry and commerce, department by department, from A to Z. It only remained to get hold of a copy. I telephoned confidently to my chief.

"I'd like a copy of the 'Bottin'," I told him. "You are our 'Bottin'," I was reminded.

"Somebody must have one."

"That may be; I haven't managed to get hold of it."

"Do I have your authority to try and get a copy?" I demanded.

"Certainly, but it won't do you any good." I got through to my colonel in the intelligence corps.

"Bottin? Haven't got one in the place, old boy," he announced cheerfully.

"Do you mean to say that in the whole length and breadth of military intelligence there's no copy of the 'Bottin'?"

"If there is, I haven't seen it," the colonel said, putting down the receiver.

I thought of getting through to De Gaulle's people, but my earlier experiences of them, together with my instructions not to do anything to upset them, dissuaded me. I tried the booksellers: nothing. With some hesitation I rang through to General Templer's office. I explained my difficulty in procuring a copy of the "Bottin" and was given another extension in the war office where it was thought they might help me.

"Colonel Denvers here."

"Oh, this is Major Buckmaster, French section of SOE."

"Of what?"

I explained roughly the nature of SOE insofar as I knew it myself and then said: "I need a copy of the 'Bottin' very badly if I'm to get on with my work."

"Who told you that we had a copy?"

"General Templer suggested I ring you."

"We're not allowed to release any of our secret material."

"Why should the 'Bottin' be secret material? The Germans have got as many copies of it as they want. What's the point of keeping material from your own side that's freely available to the enemy?"

"Look, old man, that's not my worry."

"Well, it is my worry. Your name was given me and I really would be most grateful if you could help me."

"My instructions are not to let my copy of the 'Bottin' out of my sight."

"You have got a copy then?"

"Possibly, possibly."

"Well, sir, can I come round to your office and use it there? It would still be in your sight."

"M'm, that's a thought."

I went round to the war office and managed to present myself to Colonel Denvers.

"I can't have you working actually in the room with me, Buckmaster," he told me. "I've put you in the little office my secretary uses for keeping her coat."

"Thank you very much, sir," I replied. He showed me into the fawn partitioned office. It was quite bare except for a desk and a chair, but on the desk was a copy of the 'Bottin'. I sat down and began to go through it; to my delight I discovered, as I had hoped, a preface to each chapter which detailed the industries of the department with which it dealt. The first which really

interested me was the Timken ball bearing factory, Qual Aulagnier, Asnières, Seine. I happened to know that particular factory well.

Each day I returned to the colonel's secretary's cloakroom in order to pursue my researches, comparing them with the notes I had already made and adding new details of which the names of various manufacturers and factories reminded me. After I had been working in this manner for some weeks, undisturbed either by inquiries from my commanding officer or liaison activities from other members of the SOE organization, I chanced to meet a man I knew who had something to do with the War Office library.

"Are you working here now?" he demanded.

"I have to," I complained, and went on to tell him about the "Bottin."

"What do you mean you can't take it out of the building?"

"I gather it's the only copy in the place."

"Come along with me." I followed him to a large and dusty storeroom which was piled high with various out-of-date handbooks and French guides. Under the windowsill was a stack of "Bottins." "Help yourself," he suggested.

I helped myself.

That was the end of the only work I ever did in the War Office. I thanked Colonel Denvers for his kindness, informed him deferentially where he might replenish his slender stock of "Bottins" and repaired to Baker Street. As usual, things seemed pretty quiet there. In spite of my industrious tabulation, I was still unable fully to understand what SOE was all about or when it was going to start doing whatever it was supposed to do. Patiently, I continued my study of the "Bottin"; I had reached "P" by now.

During last fall's Cuban crisis the administration released aerial photographs of missile sites. These photographs set a praiseworthy precedent of releasing information to the American public during a crisis.

It is possible that photography of known cave entrances may exist. If available, these photographs might show any recent unusual use of such cave entrances.

If such photography exists, I suggest it would be appropriate for the administration to release it now. The precedent has been set and no one can deny the situation continues to disturb many thoughtful Americans.

Finally, if there are any private persons residing in this country who possess information on Cuban caves, I ask that they send it to the Library of Congress. Tourists, campers, cave explorers, and businessmen who spent time in Cuba may have information of this type. They should send it to:

Dr. Hugh Ellsbree, Director, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, Washington 25, D.C.

#### A SELF-DEFEATING SUGAR POLICY

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall not consume all the time allotted to me, but in an extension of remarks I will discuss at great length the unfortunate situation in which we find ourselves at the present time because of the 1962 amendments to the Sugar Act which I am sure all the Members will recall, and which resulted in the members of my committee being vilified and abused as never before in my memory during my 28 years of service here.

Mr. Speaker, during the past several weeks, as our sugar situation has steadily deteriorated, there have been numerous suggestions from every quarter of the sugar community that I, as chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, take some stand on this matter. This I have thus far refused to do because it seemed to me that those officials charged with the responsibility of administering this inept parody of a sugar law had a hard enough job on their hands without those of us who had opposed its global quotas and premium recapture theories from the very first standing on the sidelines shouting "I told you so."

Now, however, it is apparent that the Department of Agriculture has lost control of the situation—that sugar prices are out of hand, and that the existing law provides no mechanism which will permit the Department of Agriculture to regain effective control of sugar prices. In fairness to the forgotten man of the 1962 Sugar Act—the American consumer—I think it is time for some plain speaking.

In New York day before yesterday the spot price of raw sugar was 6.90 cents per pound. This is 0.15 cent per pound more than 2 weeks ago; it is 0.31 cent per pound higher than it was 2 months ago; and it is 0.50 cent per pound more than refiners had to pay for raw sugar on July 13, 1962, when the Sugar Act now in effect was signed by the President. It is the highest price that American refiners have been forced to pay for raw sugar since 1924.

Speculators, apparently, do not think that, under the circumstances, this price is too high, for Tuesday, in New York on the coffee and sugar exchange, the price of futures in domestic sugar for September delivery closed at 6.90 cents per pound.

If the price of sugar should continue at the latest announced wholesale price for the remainder of 1963—and there is no assurance that it will not go higher—American consumers will pay at least \$110 million more for their sugar in 1963 than they paid in 1962.

What has happened? Why do we find ourselves in this situation? The answer is relatively simple. On July 13, 1962, when the President signed the sugar law under which we are now operating, we chose to cancel the sugar insurance policy which for 30 years had assured American consumers of ample sugar supplies at a stable and reasonable price. With the enactment of that legislation we chose, figuratively and literally, to stop paying the premium on our sugar supply-price insurance and to take our chances on the world market.

When that legislation became law, the world market price of sugar was approximately 2.86 cents per pound and the proponents of the "no premium," "global quota" policy that is written into our new law apparently assumed it was going to stay forever at that low level.

On Tuesday, however, the price of world sugar was 6.2 cents per pound, f.o.b. Caribbean ports. This is 0.3 cent per pound above the New York price, when freight and import duty amounting to about 1 cent per pound are added. This means that when present shipping commitments are fulfilled, the only way for the United States to obtain additional supplies of sugar is for our price to follow the world price upward. I have no idea how far it may go.

#### TO PROTECT THE WELFARE OF CONSUMERS OF SUGAR

The title of the Sugar Act describes its basic purposes:

To regulate commerce among the several States, with the territories and possessions of the United States, and with foreign countries; to protect the welfare of consumers of sugar and of those engaged in the domestic sugar producing industry; to promote the export trade of the United States; and for other purposes.

It has become painfully apparent that the Sugar Act, as it was revised last summer, and as the Committee on Agriculture warned might be the case, is no longer capable of carrying out one of its most basic objectives—"to protect the welfare of consumers of sugar." The upward surge in sugar prices is not yet fully reflected in the 5-pound bag the housewife buys at the local market. But the commercial and industrial users of sugar, who use about two-thirds of all we consume and who must fit the price of sugar into the price of their own end products, are understandably alarmed.

Their alarm is even greater, Mr. Speaker, when they realize that we have canceled our sugar price insurance, that the Department of Agriculture has lost control over U.S. sugar prices, that the present law gives it no tools with which to reestablish that control, and that from now on, as long as this sugar policy remains on the books, U.S. consumers will be at the mercy of world prices whenever those world prices go above the U.S. price level.

This is exactly the situation which the Committee on Agriculture warned against last summer when it refused to accept the administration's global quota proposal and reported to the House a bill continuing the sugar price and supply insurance which had operated so well for some 30 years.

#### OUR SUGAR INSURANCE POLICY

Let me be specific about what I am referring to when I discuss the insurance features of our sugar program. It is not a matter of conjecture or theory, but is written into the act itself. Section 202(d) of the Sugar Act reads:

(d) Whenever in any year any foreign country with a quota or proration thereof of more than ten thousand short tons, raw value, fails to fill such quota or proration by more than 10 per centum and at any time during such year the world price of sugar exceeds the domestic price, the quota

or proration thereof for such country for subsequent years shall be reduced by an amount equal to the amount by which such country failed to fill its quota or proration thereof, unless the Secretary finds that such failure was due to crop disaster or force majeure or finds that such reduction would be contrary to the objectives of this Act. Any reduction hereunder shall be prorated in the same manner as deficits are prorated under section 204.

In plain language, this says to sugar suppliers who are enjoying the benefits of the U.S. market that they must continue to make their regular quota shipments, at our price, during periods when the world market price is higher than the U.S. price, or they will forthwith lose that part of their quota which they do not fill. This is the insurance contract for which we have been paying the premium and which we have canceled by the premium recapture provision of the 1962 amendment.

As early as June 6, 1960, in reporting out a temporary extension of the Sugar Act, the Committee on Agriculture pointed to this basic insurance feature of our Sugar Act and warned against the "penny wise but pound foolish" policy of trying to get our foreign sugar supplies at a somewhat cheaper price on an unregulated and undependable world market.

Because of the then uncertain situation in Cuba, the 1960 bill merely extended the existing provisions of the Sugar Act for 1 year without change. The committee felt, however, that the Cuban situation might require a complete reappraisal of our sugar program and, in order that Members of Congress and the public generally might have the information on which to reach a sound judgment, it devoted 39 pages of the committee report on the bill to a detailed history and analysis of the Sugar Act and related matters.

The report pointed out and documented the supply and price insurance features for which we had been paying the premium under our Sugar Act. With respect to price it said:

An outstanding feature of the U.S. sugar program is the price stability it has brought to our domestic sugar market. Although there are fluctuations, they are within a rather narrow range—reducing uncertainties and inventory problems for consumers. Industrial users of sugar are not compelled to carry excessive sugar stocks as a hedge against a sudden large price rise, nor do they fear that the value of the working stocks they have on hand will suddenly shrink. Similarly, the American housewife can reach for sugar on her grocer's shelf with confidence not only that it will be there but also that the cost will continue to be a negligible item in the family food budget. Both the industrial user and the housewife know that the price of sugar in the United States is not only stable, but it is also reasonable by any fair standard of measurement.

This has not always been the case, as is demonstrated by table 5, which shows the retail price of refined sugar from 1913 until shortly after the effective date of the 1937 Sugar Act. In June 1920, sugar reached a price of 26.7 cents per pound, and the whole period 1913-20 was marked by steady increases in sugar prices, combined with violent fluctuations. Fluctuations continued during the 1920's with a generally descend-

ing trend in prices but with prices for the first 7 years substantially above a reasonable level, as compared to the general price structure and the price of other foods. It will be noted also that even in the depression years of the early 1930's, sugar prices did not respond downward along with all other prices and the price of sugar was relatively high compared both to the general price level and consumer income.

Since the enactment of the 1937 Sugar Act, the report pointed out, the price of sugar in the United States remained remarkably stable. Although it increased gradually from 1949 to 1959, the rate of increase was far less than that of other foods and of prices in general, and had been remarkably free from periodic fluctuation. Related to the price of all foods, the report pointed out, sugar was 4.82 cents per pound in 1939 and only 4.17 cents per pound in 1959. Related to disposable personal income in the United States, sugar was 4.57 cents per pound in 1938 and was only 2.48 cents per pound in 1959—the lowest relative price of any country in the world. It quoted a study by the United Nations showing that the retail price of sugar in the United States was nearly 5 cents per pound below the median price in 121 nations around the globe.

#### STABILITY OF SUPPLIES

With respect to the effect of our insurance policy on supply, the report pointed out that our insurance premium had guaranteed an adequate supply of sugar, at our own price, during three specific periods when the world price of sugar was above the U.S. price.

The first of these three periods was the 6 years during and immediately following World War II, during all of which time we obtained our foreign supplies at less than the world price, and in the full amount required. During 14 months of the Korean war the world price was above our price but our offshore sugar supplies continued to come into the United States without interruption, at our domestic price, although the world price at one time was 1.85 cents per pound above the U.S. price. Again, during 6 months of the Suez crisis we received an uninterrupted flow of sugar at our price, although the world price was higher and in April 1957, was 1.34 cents per pound above the U.S. price.

In view of this stability of price and supply which we had obtained under the program of statutory foreign quotas embodied in the Sugar Act and involving, at times, the payment of a quota premium, the committee contrasted and warned against the risk of depending for our foreign sugar supplies on an uncertain and volatile world market. With respect to the world market, the committee report of June 6, 1960, said:

The very use of the terms "world price" and "world market" are a misleading use of words. Only about 12 percent of the world's sugar production is traded on the misnamed "world market." This is essentially unwanted sugar and the trading in this small part of the world's sugar supply cannot and does not establish a true world price or reflect the actual value of sugar. However, because of the very character of this so-called world market, it is an extremely volatile market reacting violently to international tensions or to changes in supply and de-



mand. The assumption, therefore, that the United States could buy its sugar cheaper on the world market than it is obtaining it under the Sugar Act is not necessarily valid. Not only would American consumers be the victims of the wild price fluctuations and supply uncertainties of the world sugar market, but that market might very well be higher than the existing American price under our quota system.

With respect to the quota premium—the price we pay for our sugar insurance—the report said:

The difference between the so-called world price and the U.S. price has on occasions been called the quota premium, or more popularly, the subsidy in our sugar program. This approach is carried even further to say that the amount of protection or subsidy involved in the American sugar program is the amount of the difference in the two prices, multiplied by the amount of sugar purchased. This is an exaggerated statement of the protection afforded by the Sugar Act and is such an oversimplification of a basically complicated economic situation as to be misleading. It is obvious that the amount of quota premium or subsidy, if one exists, is not the difference between the U.S. price and the so-called world price with the Sugar Act in effect, it is the difference between the price received by supplying areas for their sugar now and the price they would receive if we had no sugar program.

In May 1962 the committee issued and gave wide distribution to a document called "History and Operations of the U.S. Sugar Program," in which it updated and slightly revised, for the information of the Congress and the general public, the material which had appeared in the 1960 committee report.

Again, the committee warned against abandoning the price and supply assurance provided by the statutory quotas of the Sugar Act for the dangers and uncertainties which it felt were inseparable from a program based upon a global quota at world market prices.

#### HOW STATUTORY QUOTA SYSTEM WORKED

Why did our statutory quota system work and how did it provide us with price and supply insurance? The answer is very simple. The United States offers the largest and most stable sugar market in the world. Ordinarily the price of sugar in the United States, established and controlled under the provisions of our Sugar Act, is somewhat above the so-called world price. Year in and year out, whether our price is above or below the world market, it offers sugar producers a certain market for a specific quantity of sugar at a stable and assured price.

Sugar is a long-term crop. It takes from 18 months to 3 years between the planting of the cane and the harvesting of the sugar. It is an expensive crop to produce. Clearly it is to the economic advantage of a sugar producer to know at the time he plants his cane where he will be able to sell his sugar and approximately how much he will receive for it, rather than to take his chances on an uncertain and unknown world market. In order to maintain his right to ship into this stable U.S. market, he will continue his regular quota shipments to us at our price even at times when the world market price may be substantially higher than the price he

will receive in New York. It is simply sound long-range economics for him to do so and it is also sound long-range economics for the U.S. consumers of sugar to have this kind of price and supply insurance.

The first indication that the executive branch of the Government might be succumbing to the momentarily attractive but basically unsound idea of obtaining our foreign sugar supplies on an open world market came in an article in the New York Times in August 1961 quoting an unnamed person at the State Department to the effect that when the Sugar Act was extended, serious consideration should be given to abandoning the system of foreign country quotas and obtaining our sugar from foreign sources on the basis of a "global quota" and without payment of the so-called quota premium.

Casual inquiry at the State Department failed to turn up the author of any such statement and brought, instead, denial on the part of several officials that such a proposal was under consideration.

Notwithstanding these denials, members of the Committee on Agriculture, well aware of the value to U.S. consumers of the insurance we had been purchasing with our quota premium, were disturbed by the newspaper story. So that there could be no misunderstanding of the committee's position on this matter, the committee unanimously adopted on September 7, 1961, the following resolution, which was transmitted to the Secretaries of Agriculture and State:

Whereas it has come to the attention of this committee that certain officials in the executive branch of the Government are reported to favor the adoption of a "global quota" system for the importation of sugar into the United States; and

Whereas the existing system under which specific import quotas are established by law has for many years operated effectively to protect domestic sugar production, assure consumers of ample sugar supplies at fair and stable prices, and to promote the export trade of the United States: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That this committee would regard with extreme disfavor any action or statement by any representative of the United States at the conference in Geneva, Switzerland, on the International Sugar Agreement which would commit the United States or imply, either directly or indirectly, any commitment on the part of the United States to adopt any system of sugar importation other than fixed statutory quotas as have heretofore operated so effectively under the Sugar Act of 1948 and previous laws.

Having delivered itself of this pronouncement with respect to global quotas and having, so it assumed, made it quite clear to the executive branch that if there were any inclinations in this direction they had better be abandoned, the committee sat back with some complacency to wait the recommendations of the executive branch, in connection with the upcoming revision and extension of the Sugar Act, as to how the foreign country quotas should be allocated.

#### GLOBAL QUOTAS EMERGE

Apparently, however, the advocates of the global quota theory did not read the committee's resolution for they con-

tinued their activities and succeeded in having written into the President's budget message of January 18, 1962, the following statement:

The Sugar Act expires on June 30, 1962. Legislation will be proposed extending it with substantial revisions to bring this program into line with the greatly changed world sugar situation. Under this legislation the difference between the domestic and world price of sugar, which is currently received by foreign suppliers of sugar, will be retained by the United States to the extent permitted by existing international agreements, with an estimated increase in 1963 budget receipts of \$180 million.

Although the President did not mention global quotas but only recapture of the quota premium, the two are inseparable. A country quota is of no value, either to the supplying country or to the United States, if there is no incentive to fulfill that quota by steady shipments of sugar into our market in foul weather as well as in fair. Recapture of the so-called quota premium would have removed this incentive. It would cancel the insurance.

On February 15, 1962, the Director of the Department of Agriculture's Sugar Division, in a major speech before the Sugar Club of New York, disclosed the details of the proposed global quota and premium recapture scheme. The members of the Committee on Agriculture and the whole sugar community of the United States were shocked, not so much by the proposal itself, as by the flimsy arguments which were advanced in its support.

This plan, it was said, would provide greater flexibility of supply and greater assurance of price, when the speaker well knew that the world sugar market is one of the most undependable markets in the world.

With Cuba out of the supply picture, it was said, there was no other country to which we could turn with assurance for our 3 million tons of foreign sugar—in spite of the fact that in the crop year 1961-62 Western Hemisphere countries outside of Cuba and the United States produced 11,749,000 tons of sugar and one country alone, Brazil, more than 4 million tons.

Premium recapture and global quotas, it was stated, would give us greater assurance of supplies, although the sugar would have to be procured from the very same countries which might expect country quotas, and at a price offering no incentive to ship to the United States instead of to some other country.

It implied that American consumers would be saved the quota premiums which were really "foreign relief expenditures by American consumers" although there was nothing in the proposal which would reduce the price of sugar to American consumers by even \$1 of the premium recapture and there was the great danger—as we have now discovered—that the scheme might prove extremely costly to consumers.

Before the 1st session of the 87th Congress adjourned in the fall of 1961, I had announced that, in order to give the Congress ample time to consider new sugar legislation before the expiration of

the existing law on June 30, 1962, the Committee on Agriculture would begin hearings on sugar legislation as soon as possible after the convening of the 2d session of the 87th Congress in January 1962. In furtherance of this objective, I asked both the Department of Agriculture and the domestic sugar industry to have their recommendations ready for the committee before the convening of the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

The Department agreed to have its recommendations in our hands by December 1, 1961, then postponed the date to the end of December, then told us they would have their recommendations to us by the time Congress convened, but when that time arrived indefinitely postponed the submission of their recommendations on sugar.

The speech of the Director of the Sugar Branch in New York on February 15, 1962, at least served to explain the long delay by the Department in submitting its recommendations. It was apparent from that speech that a struggle had been going on within the administration between the proponents of the premium recapture, global quota theory and those who wanted to retain the basic insurance features of our then existing sugar law, and that the global quota advocates had won out.

#### PRESSURE FOR GLOBAL QUOTAS

Thereafter, while the committee waited impatiently for recommendations from the Department of Agriculture, there followed a long series of meetings between representatives of the Department of Agriculture and of the Department of State, and representatives of the domestic sugar industry—both producers and consumers. The basic purpose of these meetings was to try to persuade the domestic sugar industry to back the global quota, premium recapture theory to which the administration had by that time apparently committed itself. In spite of all the inducements which could be held out by the Government spokesmen, the industry representatives refused to lend their support to a proposal which they considered to be essentially unsound.

Finally, about May 1, when there was still no recommendation forthcoming from the Department of Agriculture with respect to sugar, I announced that hearings on sugar legislation would start on May 15, whether the recommendations of the Department had been received or not.

Faced with this deadline, the Department finally submitted its recommendations on May 14. The Department's recommendations were that the existing foreign country quotas, with the exception of the Philippines and Cuba, should be continued at the low level provided in the old law but that even these quotas should be eliminated over a period of 5 years by applying an import fee at the cumulative rate of 20 percent per year on the difference between the world market and the U.S. price for raw sugar. Thus, at the end of 5 years all of these quotas, including that for Cuba, would

be rendered completely ineffective because sugar would be purchased under them only at world market prices, giving the United States no preference in the exports of such country. The Philippine premium was not to be reduced because this is protected by treaty.

The Cuban quota would have been continued at its existing level of somewhat more than 3 million tons except for a reduction of about 600,000 tons which was allocated to domestic producers. As long as Cuba remained in Communist hands, the Cuban quota would have been withdrawn and put on a global quota basis with recapture of the entire difference between the world market price and the U.S. price.

This meant, in effect, that as long as diplomatic relations with Cuba remained as they were, the approximately 2.6 million tons of sugar allocated to Cuba would be bought on the world market at world market prices. This would be accomplished by issuing import permits within the limitation of the global quota but collecting on each pound of sugar an import fee established by the Department of Agriculture as the difference between the world market price and the domestic price for raw sugar.

Under this proposal there would be no more inducement for a foreign sugar producer to sell his sugar to the United States than to any other country in the world. It was a proposal which might operate successfully during periods of sugar surplus, when the world market price was seriously depressed, but which placed our sugar supplies at the mercy of world markets and speculators in periods when, for any reason, the world price of sugar was above the U.S. price.

It abandoned completely the principles of price and supply insurance which the Sugar Act had established and which had operated so beneficially for almost 30 years.

#### EXPERTS OPPOSE GLOBAL QUOTA

In the subsequent hearings on the proposed legislation, every sugar expert who appeared before the committee warned of the dangers inherent in this proposed policy. At the conclusion of the hearings, the first action taken by the committee in executive session was to vote unanimously to reject the global quota, premium recapture proposal and to continue the price and supply insurance embodied in statutory country quotas regulating our foreign sugar supplies.

Accordingly, this committee reported a bill reducing the Cuban quota to 1.5 million tons and assigning larger quotas to the domestic beet and cane areas, to the Philippines, and to other sugar producing countries, chiefly in the Western Hemisphere, which assured the committee that they were able and willing to provide sugar under our quota system regardless of the level of world prices. The Cuban quota was withheld from that country as long as we are not in diplomatic relations and was assigned on a year-by-year basis to other Western Hemisphere countries able to provide the sugar.

In protection of American sugar consumers, and in order to maintain price

stability regardless of the level of world prices, sugar shipped to the United States under both the permanent and temporary quotas would be paid for at the U.S. price, regardless of the level of world prices.

The House approved the bill as reported by the committee. The Senate, on the other hand, swallowed the global quota proposal hook, line, and sinker, and adopted a bill exactly as recommended by the administration. In conference, the House was forced to accept a compromise with which it thoroughly disagreed, which it felt to be dangerous and unworkable, in order to have any sugar act at all. Due to the administration's delay in submitting its recommendations, the old law was within 2 days of expiring at the time the conference was held and it was unthinkable that we should be without any sugar act, for the domestic sugar industry cannot exist without it.

#### THE COMPROMISE BILL

The compromise bill adopted most of the permanent foreign country quotas established in the House bill but provided that the so-called quota premium should be recaptured at the cumulative rate of 10 percent per year, rendering these quotas valueless at the end of 10 years, and provided further that the quota withheld from Cuba, established in the conference bill at 1,635,000 tons, should be obtained from any supplier with full recapture of the so-called quota premium, in other words on the world market and at the world market price.

As Members of the House will recall, even before this hybrid bill became law, the administration realized part of the unwisdom of its position and got the Senate to add on to a House bill relating to honeybees a provision restoring 150,000 tons of the country quotas which had been provided in the House bill and deleted in the conference.

The evil of the premium recapture and the global quota remained, however, and we are now beginning to reap the harvest of this ill-advised action.

No sooner had the 1962 Sugar Act been signed by the President on July 13—marking the entry of the United States into the world sugar market for approximately 600,000 tons—than world sugar prices started an upward spiral which has continued virtually without interruption since that time.

The following table shows for the period beginning January 1, 1962, the weekly average spot price of raw sugar on the domestic market and the world market, the weekly average wholesale price of refined sugar in the northeast area of the United States, and the monthly average retail price of refined sugar. In order to compare the world price of raw sugar with the domestic price, it is necessary to add to the world price approximately 1 cent per pound for transportation, insurance, handling, and tariff duty, and then to add to this figure the amount of the import fee established by the Department of Agriculture. This fee was originally set at 2.4 cents per pound.



1962 average weekly and monthly spot prices for domestic and world raw sugar, and wholesale refined sugar in Northeast; average monthly U.S. retail prices for refined sugar

[Cents per pound]

Week ending—	Raw sugar		Refined sugar		Week ending—	Raw sugar		Refined sugar	
	Domestic spot price	World spot price	Wholesale Northeast	Retail United States		Domestic spot price	World spot price	Wholesale Northeast	Retail United States
1962					1962—Continued				
Jan. 6	6.45	2.43	9.30		Aug. 4	6.44	3.03	9.60	
13	6.45	2.43	9.30		11	6.48	3.11	9.60	
20	6.46	2.30	9.30		18	6.56	3.27	9.60	
27	6.46	2.16	9.50		25	6.60	3.35	9.60	
Month of January	6.45	2.30	9.37	11.62	Month of August	6.54	3.24	9.62	11.72
Feb. 3	6.40	2.14	9.50		Sept. 1	6.59	3.35	9.70	
10	6.40	2.32	9.50		8	6.40	3.35	9.70	
17	6.36	2.34	9.50		15	6.35	3.17	9.70	
24	6.35	2.38	9.50		22	6.45	3.08	9.70	
Month of February	6.37	2.36	9.50	11.70	29	6.50	3.17	9.70	
Mar. 3	6.37	2.53	9.50		Month of September	6.43	3.18	9.70	11.76
10	6.40	2.64	9.50		Oct. 6	6.52	3.19	9.70	
17	6.42	2.62	9.50		13	6.54	3.19	9.70	
24	6.45	2.65	9.50		20	6.53	3.20	9.70	
31	6.45	2.74	9.50		27	6.53	3.42	9.70	
Month of March	6.43	2.65	9.50	11.68	Month of October	6.52	3.28	9.70	11.76
Apr. 7	6.45	2.78	9.60		Nov. 3	6.41	3.49	9.70	
14	6.47	2.70	9.60		10	6.40	3.50	9.70	
21	6.44	2.69	9.60		17	6.44	3.55	9.70	
28	6.39	2.60	9.60		24	6.45	3.72	9.70	
Month of April	6.43	2.69	9.60	11.64	Month of November	6.44	3.65	9.70	11.78
May 5	6.38	2.51	9.60		Dec. 1	6.50	3.82	9.70	
12	6.42	2.58	9.60		8	6.50	4.05	9.70	
19	6.42	2.68	9.60		15	6.53	4.22	9.70	
26	6.46	2.64	9.60		22	6.55	4.34	9.70	
Month of May	6.43	2.60	9.60	11.64	29	6.60	4.72	9.83	
June 2	6.49	2.60	9.60		Month of December	6.54	4.29	9.72	11.76
9	6.50	2.54	9.60						
16	6.47	2.64	9.60		1963				
23	6.43	2.66	9.60		Jan. 4	6.62	4.85	9.90	
30	6.38	2.70	9.60		11	6.69	5.20	9.90	
Month of June	6.45	2.63	9.60	11.68	18	6.72	5.43	10.02	
July 7	6.37	2.84	9.60		25	6.72	5.66	10.05	
14	6.40	2.86	9.60		Feb. 1	6.72	5.80	10.05	
21	6.40	2.96	9.60		8	6.72	5.99	10.05	
28	6.36	2.97	9.60		15	6.77	6.05	10.05	
Month of July	6.39	2.92	9.60	11.72	22	6.82	6.05	10.05	

Source: New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange spot prices for raw sugar, No. 7 contract domestic and No. 8 contract for world price. Trade sources for wholesale refined prices and U.S. Department of Labor for retail price.

As will be noted from the table, at the time the bill became law and the Department of Agriculture announced its global quota and established an import fee of 2.4 cents per pound, the world spot price was 2.86 cents per pound and the domestic price was 6.40 cents per pound. Adding to the world price the 1 cent charge for transportation and duty and the 2.4 cents charge for the import fee, brought the world price up to 6.26 cents per pound, New York basis. This gave foreign suppliers an incentive of 0.14 cent per pound to sell on our market and made, for the moment, a workable program.

#### OPERATIONS UNDER THE NEW LAW

Under the procedure used by the Department of Agriculture, having announced the quantity to be permitted entry under the global quota, it accepted advance commitments from foreign suppliers for delivery prior to a specified date and required that these commitments be accompanied by a binder of 0.5 cent per pound—this amount to be forfeited if the sugar was not imported into the United States within the specified time limit.

Under the import fee of 2.4 cents per pound, the Department succeeded in obtaining commitments for the full quantity of approximately 600,000 tons of sugar in the global quota for the balance of the calendar year 1962.

It is to be remembered, however, this commitment to ship to the United States does not include any commitment as to the price at which the sugar will be sold

in the United States. As will be noted from the table, the world price continued to advance, particularly late in the year as predictions of a short Cuban sugar crop and of unfavorable growing conditions affecting beet sugar production in Europe and both beet and cane sugar in the United States, indicated an even shorter world supply situation in 1963 than had been assumed at the time of our hearing. The sharp increase in the world price—from 2.86 in the week ending July 14 to 4.72 in the week ending December 29—was, therefore, reflected by a smaller but substantial increase in the U.S. price—from 6.40 in the week ending July 14 to 6.60 in the week ending January 29.

By the time in late November when the Department of Agriculture had to announce its intentions with respect to total consumption figures and quotas for 1963, it was apparent that the import fee of 2.4 cents per pound which had been set for 1962 represented far more than the difference between world prices and desirable U.S. prices, and would not result in any sugar being shipped to the United States under the global quota. In the late November announcement, therefore, the Department of Agriculture set the proposed import fee for 1963 at 1.8 cents per pound.

In the 2 weeks that intervened between the time of this preliminary announcement and the issuance of the official quota proclamation with respect to 1963 on December 7, 1962, it became apparent that the 1.8 cents import fee was also too

high and would not bring in the global quota sugar we required. Therefore, in the official announcement of December 7, 1962, the import fee on global quota sugar for 1963 was established at 1.4 cents per pound. At the same time, the Department announced a global quota of 750,000 tons for the first 5 months of 1963.

In spite of the Department's optimistic estimates, by mid-January 1963 it had succeeded in obtaining commitments for only 115,000 tons of the 750,000 tons of global quota sugar we will require during the first 5 months of 1963, and U.S. consumers were faced with an actual sugar shortage if the situation remained unchanged.

Accordingly, on January 23 the Department eliminated altogether the premium recapture it had so strongly advocated and reduced the import fee to zero. World sugar could now be shipped into the United States without the payment of any import fee.

#### NO ASSURANCE OF PRICE

The significant things about this action, Mr. Speaker, are: First, that instead of the optimistic predictions of the great amounts of money which would be collected by sugar import fees and might be used in foreign aid programs, the Department had collected from mid-July to mid-January a total of only \$39.5 million and they had done this at a cost to American consumers of more than \$17 million in the last 5 months of 1962; second, and of even greater significance is that in reducing the import fee to zero,

the United States had played its last free card in the game to stabilize U.S. sugar prices.

From this point on, there is little, if anything, that the Department of Agriculture can do under the existing law to maintain a stable level of sugar prices in the United States. From this point on, our prices are tied irrevocably to the world market price; and in order to obtain sugar supplies we will have to pay whatever fantastic price may be commanded on the world market.

On January 31 the Department of Agriculture added 350,000 tons to the global quota for delivery prior to September 30—at the full domestic price and without the imposition of any import fee. It has obtained commitments for all of this 1.1 million tons of global quota sugar, and this fact is being pointed to with great glee by some advocates of the global quota, premium recapture theory as proof that this system is working.

What they neglect to point out, Mr. Speaker, is first, these commitments were obtained only after the premium recapture idea was abandoned and we agreed to pay foreign suppliers the full U.S. premium price; second, the commitments to deliver sugar contain no assurance whatever as to price.

Similar commitments were obtained in July 1962 with respect to global quota deliveries during the balance of that year, but this did not prevent the New York price from going up from 6.35 in the week ending September 15 to 6.60 in the week ending December 29. Likewise, the commitments now made with respect to 1963 will not prevent foreign suppliers from selling this sugar in New York for the highest possible price they can get for it.

Third, these commitments do not even assure us that the sugar will be shipped to the United States. The suppliers have put up a binder of 0.5 cent per pound to assure delivery, but this is the only assurance we have. If, by any chance, we should succeed in keeping the U.S. price of sugar more than 0.5 cent per pound below the world market price, it would clearly be to the advantage of the foreign sugar suppliers to sell their sugar elsewhere and forfeit the binder they have put up with the United States.

#### WHO GETS THE BENEFITS?

During the hearings and the debate on this sugar bill last summer, the fallacious argument was made that the payment of our insurance premium on foreign sugar was a form of foreign aid, that there was no assurance this premium payment was reaching the workers in the cane fields and the small sugar planters but that, in fact, it might be benefiting only the large mills and exporters. It should have been clear to anyone that there was far more chance of benefit to small cane producers and the workers in the fields from a steady, guaranteed price and market such as is afforded under the statutory country quota system than from a world market at the depressed price level where these same persons assumed we would be able to buy sugar permanently, and where the price has to stay in order for the premium recapture scheme to work.

It would be interesting to hear now from those whose hearts bled so copiously for the cane field worker, who they think is getting the profits from this uncontrolled increase in sugar prices. They can be assured that none of this price increase is going to the worker in the cane field, probably very little of it to the small cane grower, and in many instances not even to the foreign millowner and producer of raw sugar. Instead, much of the tremendous profit being reaped from these high sugar prices is going to traders and speculators and downright gamblers.

Activity on the New York sugar futures market has increased tenfold since the 1962 Sugar Act became law. Prior to that, under our stabilized country quota system, there was very little need for hedging by legitimate sugar interests and almost no profit to be had in speculation. Since the enactment of that law trading in sugar futures has mushroomed and much of it is downright gambling speculation.

Just as an example of what has occurred, I asked a Government expert in futures market operations to calculate the paper profits which would have been made by a speculator who bought one sugar future contract on the New York market at the time the 1962 Sugar Act was passed and then pyramided this speculative holding each time the price went up sufficiently for him to buy a new contract. The answer is interesting. If a speculator had invested \$400 in a world sugar contract for future delivery during the week ending July 14, 1962, and then had pyramided his holdings as I have indicated, he would now have a profit of \$185,000 on an investment of \$400.

#### NO INSURANCE FOR THE FUTURE

Unlike some of those whose voices have been heard most stridently on this subject, Mr. Speaker, I do not claim to be a sugar expert. I am not predicting that before this year is out we may be forced to pay as much as 8 or 9 cents a pound for raw sugar, with a corresponding increase in the price of the refined product. I am not predicting that when 1964 rolls around and new sugar quotas come into effect the quota areas, both foreign and domestic—in the light of this year's experience—may withhold or slow down deliveries under quota in order to help push the price upward—for it must be remembered that quota holders as well as speculators on the world market benefit from higher prices. I am not predicting that in 1964 the Soviet bloc will acquire enough of the so-called world market of sugar to drive the price up and then feed its cheaply acquired holdings back into the market at high prices for hard currency, although there is some suspicion in sugar circles that this is going on now.

I do not predict that these things will happen, Mr. Speaker. I merely point out—and I hope the House will consider this most seriously—that in abandoning our statutory quota policy we have canceled our sugar insurance and under the global quota, premium recapture theory of the new law, these things can happen

and there is little or nothing we can do to prevent it.

Mr. Speaker, I have said many times on the floor of this House that sugar is one of the most complex and highly involved subjects with which Congress had to deal. It is, therefore, a subject on which it is easy for pseudoexperts, wild-haired theorists, and voluble commentators to make their voices heard, and to sound convincing. I apologize to the House for taking this much of its time to discuss this subject but I consider this matter to be of such great importance to every sugar consumer in the United States that the House has a right to a full explanation of the situation and to know where I, and I believe the whole Committee on Agriculture, stand on this matter. In my own defense for taking this much of your time may I point out that I have discussed only one aspect of this complicated subject of sugar—the responsibility to protect U.S. consumers both as to supplies and prices. May I point out some of the things I have not discussed.

I have not, for example, discussed the importance of a workable and effective sugar act to our domestic sugar producing industry, to the beet sugar producers of continental United States, to the cane producers of Louisiana and Florida, and to the sugar producers and, in fact, the whole economic well-being of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands and to the domestic beet processors and cane refiners.

I have not discussed the importance of a fair and equitable sugar program to our export trade although the promotion of that export trade is one of the basic objectives of the sugar act. In the fiscal year 1961, exports from the United States to countries holding statutory quotas under the 1962 Sugar Act, not counting India and the Netherlands, were valued at over \$3.3 billion, of which \$420 million were agricultural exports. The dollars we spend for sugar come directly back to us for exports from the United States. I am not discussing at this time the effect it might have on those exports if those who advocated the premium recapture theory were able to force those sugar exporting countries to sell their sugar to us at a loss on a depressed world market, instead of at the fair and equitable level of the U.S. market.

I am not discussing the possibilities, on the erratic world market we are helping to create, for the Soviet bloc to obtain Cuban sugar under cheap barter contracts and build up its hard currency holdings by selling this at high prices into the world market.

I am not discussing the bewildering and discouraging effect on our good neighbors to the south of a sugar policy admittedly designed to force them to sell us their sugar supplies at ruinously low prices, when at the same time we are making loud protestations of our concern for their economic well-being; when at the very time we were destroying the stability of the sugar market we were promoting an international conference to stabilize by quotas and other devices the price of coffee. The goal of



stabilized commodity prices was sufficiently important to them that they stated in the charter of Punta del Este that one of the charter's primary purposes was:

To find a quick and lasting solution to the grave problem created by excessive price fluctuations in the basic exports of Latin American countries on which their prosperity so heavily depends.

The people of the sugar producing countries of Latin America find it hard to understand, as I do, why we would sign such a pledge, and then, less than a year later, flagrantly and openly violate it by adopting a system of sugar procurement which, far from "finding a solution to the grave problem of excessive price fluctuations in the basic exports of Latin America," instead insured greater price fluctuations than existed before we signed it. It would be hard to conceive of legislation which is better designed to lose friends and alienate people.

Although I have taken much time of the House, Mr. Speaker, there are a great many important aspects of this sugar matter which I have not discussed.

#### WE SHOULD RENEW OUR INSURANCE POLICY

Now, you may well ask, What are we going to do about it?

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, we should renew our insurance policy. We should return again to a system of statutory country quotas established by Congress, pay the premium that is necessary to assure us of supply and price stability, and strictly enforce that provision of the law which summarily withdraws from any country permanently any part of its quota which it fails to fill because of more attractive prices on the world market. I assure you that if it were ever necessary to take action under this provision of the law, there would be no dearth of other suppliers ready and able to take over that obligation. And I assure you that this system will work, as it has for 30 years, to guarantee U.S. consumers adequate sugar supplies at reasonable and stable prices.

#### What will we do about Cuba?

I think that we should continue a statutory quota of approximately 1.5 million tons held in reserve for Cuba until such time as the Communist regime is overthrown and that island again returns to the family of free nations. Until such time, of course, Cuba would get none of this quota. Instead, it should be allotted by Congress on a temporary year-to-year basis to other sugar-producing countries able and willing to supply our needs.

I admit, Mr. Speaker, that there may be some tendency on the part of countries receiving these temporary allocations to consider them of a permanent character, but I believe that this possibility has been grossly exaggerated by the proponents of the ruinous global quota, premium recapture theory. Our friends to the south are reasonable and intelligent. They would know that the very law which temporarily divides the Cuban quota among them provides, by its own terms, that the quota will be returned to Cuba when it returns to the family of free nations. They would know when they accepted the temporary Cuban

allotment that it is likely to be withdrawn at any time and only in the most reckless disregard of reality would they make plans on the assumption that this would be a permanent quota.

The very fact that the Cuban quota would be reallocated among other countries by Congress on a year-to-year basis would be a constant reminder of its temporary character. This would also, in my opinion, be the best possible way to assure that, to the greatest extent possible, our purchases of sugar at the U.S. price from these supplying countries is reciprocated by their purchase of our products. The present Sugar Act contains a provision giving some preferences in global quota purchases to those countries agreeing to purchase U.S. agricultural commodities. Admittedly, this is a cumbersome and difficult provision to administer. It would be much more effective, in my opinion, if countries temporarily filling a part of the Cuban quota knew that the allotment of that quota was to be reviewed each year by Congress and that in making new allotments, their purchase of our agricultural commodities would be taken into consideration.

Those opposed to handling the temporary allocation of the Cuban quota in this manner have contended that it would be unfair to the countries receiving a portion of that Cuban quota to give them a definite temporary allotment because this would cause them to increase sugar production and construct facilities to fill an allotment which might be withdrawn at any time, to their great financial loss. Those who make this argument overlook three rather important facts: First, the quantity of sugar involved is no larger, in fact is exactly the same, as the quantity to be acquired under the global purchase program and would come from substantially the same countries; second, there is already in existence in the Western Hemisphere outside of the United States and Cuba sugar production amounting to 11.5 million tons per year, out of which we would take, both with our permanent and temporary quotas, a total of only approximately 3 million tons; third, the temporary allotments of the Cuban quota would not be made to countries who did not, at that time, have in operation sufficient sugar-producing capacity to meet the allotment—thus no new facilities or additional cane fields would be required.

These were the essential provisions of the House bill, Mr. Speaker. The Committee of Agriculture devoted weeks of study to the preparation of that bill. The House passed the bill by an overwhelming majority. Looking back at it now, there was not much wrong with that bill.

It is unfortunate that in conference we were forced to make ruinous compromises with a bill which had been considered by a committee in the other body only a few days and where even that short time had not been devoted to the study of sugar, but in large part to questioning the motives of the witnesses who appeared before the committee.

Am I going to introduce such a bill tomorrow?

Mr. Speaker, I am not.

Never in my memory of 28 years as a Member of Congress and a member of the House Committee on Agriculture has my committee, its members, or myself, been subjected to the kind of pressure, abuse, and downright vilification as we were during that period when, in our knowledge of and experience with the Sugar Act, we were trying to enact a bill which would protect the consumers of the United States against exactly the kind of price increase they are now faced with, and at the same time be a measure of friendship and helpfulness to our friendly neighbors in this hemisphere.

I do not want to dwell on this, Mr. Speaker, and I hold no personal animosity but I have no intention of putting my committee or myself through this kind of an ordeal again. I have no intention of subjecting them again to the barrage of propaganda, criticism, slanted newspaper articles, cartoons, and pressure that they went through last summer.

I will introduce a bill and call it up promptly in my committee when, and only when, those who got us into this mess indicate clearly that they now see the error of their ways and are willing to cooperate with the Committee on Agriculture in writing a new Sugar Act that will restore our statutory obligations, reinstate our sugar price and supply insurance, and give the fullest possible protection to the forgotten man of our present law—the U.S. consumer.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Who does the gentleman mean by "they"?

Mr. COOLEY. The proponents of global quotas in the administration. That is, with the help of the U.S. Senate.

The gentleman will recall our bill came out of committee without serious opposition. It passed this House with very little opposition, if any. There was opposition to one provision affecting the Dominican Republic. But our bill passed the House and everybody was pleased with the sugar program it established. All segments of the industry, foreign and domestic, were satisfied.

It went over to the Senate, and we were forced to make concessions because the law was expiring. We had assurances we would have \$180 million. That has not been true. We have cut off all of the recapture possibilities. We are not recapturing anything, and it is costing the American consumers at the rate of \$110 million in higher prices in 1963.

Mr. GROSS. Has the State Department played any part in this?

Mr. COOLEY. I am certain the State Department has. I am certain that many other departments of the Government have played a part in it.

We made this concession in the conference. The gentleman will recall that those who opposed the House bill concluded overnight they had made a mistake. So we had a little honey-bee bill in the Senate. They put amendments

on the honey-bee bill and picked up another 150,000 tons and made it on a country-to-country allocation.

Mr. Speaker, I advocate a return to the old sugar law which operated so well for so long, almost 30 years. During all of that time we had fair prices and stable supplies. Now we are at the mercy of a world market that can be manipulated by the Soviets cooperating with Cuba. We are, therefore, at the mercy of a world market, which is going to result in injury to the American producers and the American consumers. There is no telling what it will cost in the end.

I am not going to start anything. I am not going to introduce any bill unless those who got us into this mess come to us and ask us to correct the errors that have been made. We should go back to the former program that has operated so well over the years.

I do not want to bore you with a long discussion, but I do have the facts and figures here, and they will appear in the RECORD tomorrow morning.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Do I understand the gentleman is advocating the principle that is enunciated in the Jones Act that we had for about 30 years?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right. The law has been operating for 25 or 30 years. We had country-by-country quotas. Our committee sat over there and allocated 9,700,000 tons of sugar, every pound of it. We did not leave it to anybody's discretion, but we were forced in conference to go to this global quota proposition that will not work and cannot work.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. As I understand it, the gentleman's committee did go ahead and try to work out a program that would fit into the law at that time?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The bill went to the Senate and through the pressure that was put on what your committee had adopted, the bill was changed in the final analysis?

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The question of the allocation of quotas to other countries was involved. The other departments were taken out of the law, which has resulted in an increased cost of sugar to the consumers of the United States of approximately \$110 million?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The gentleman believes that the proper approach would be to return to the law that has worked so well for 30 years?

Mr. COOLEY. I certainly do.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Under the present bill what assurance do the cane and beet producers have as to stability?

Mr. COOLEY. The domestic cane and beet producers have their quotas. But the consumers have no assurance or insurance. They are dependent on a

market here that might go on up. You do not know what is going to happen.

The Soviet Union and Cuba can if they choose, manipulate the world market and we will be at their mercy.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for calling this situation to the attention of the Members of the House and ask him again if I heard correctly that an individual, a speculator, could have taken \$400 and pyramided or parlayed it into \$185,000?

Mr. COOLEY. One hundred and eighty-five thousand dollars, since last July.

Mr. GROSS. Since last July?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, sir. These figures I have had checked and double-checked by the best advised people in Washington in the administrative branch of the Government, so I am quite certain that they are correct.

Mr. GROSS. And this could have been done on the basis of the legislation passed by Congress in the last session?

Mr. COOLEY. It was done on the basis of the world price of sugar, which our legislation has helped to skyrocket.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I know that the gentleman has no connection with this situation so I do not mean to propound a question to him. But I would call the attention of the House, since he mentioned coffee a little while ago, that there is pending in the other body, a coffee agreement for ratification, since it is in the nature of a treaty, that I hope will be thoroughly scrutinized by Members of the other body and by the Members of the House before it is ratified. Personally I have serious doubts about this coffee agreement for I understand it will result in substantially increased prices for coffee to American consumers.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman knows that the sugar program operated so well and so satisfactorily that the ordinary housewife was not even aware of the fact that we had a sugar program. Over the years this program had operated at a net profit to the Treasury of more than \$450 million, not counting import duties of as much as \$37 million a year. We had ample supplies. Why in the world anybody would want to disturb a program that had operated as well as that I do not know.

Mr. GROSS. There had to be some changes in the sugar program in view of the fact that we had been obtaining a very substantial amount of sugar from Cuba; but this did not make it necessary for Congress to enact legislation that would open the door to what has happened.

Mr. COOLEY. I know. We could have gotten that sugar, we could have replaced the Cuban sugar by buying it from other sources of supply.

Mr. GROSS. Without changing the law?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes. We took away the Cuban quota. Then under the law we could have allocated that quota to other countries, and I was interested in

giving it to the friendly countries in the Western Hemisphere. We tried our best to do that.

#### KAISER FOUNDATION MEDICAL CARE PROGRAM—THE NATION'S LARGEST PREPAID DIRECT SERVICE MEDICAL AND HOSPITAL PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, over the past two decades I have watched a private enterprise pattern for providing medical care take shape and grow in my part of the Nation. In 1943, when I first came here as a Member of the 78th Congress, this pattern was one industry's solution to providing medical care for its own workmen in badly overcrowded wartime communities. This industrial program has evolved into the largest voluntary medical care plan of its kind in our Nation—a plan now serving a diverse membership larger than the populations of each of 13 of our 50 States.

I am speaking of the Kaiser Foundation medical care program. Undoubtedly the name is a familiar one. It is receiving more and more favorable attention, both here and abroad, as more and more responsible individuals concern themselves with the problems of organizing and financing medical care, and closely study all types of existing solutions.

Recently I talked at length with the leaders of this program and then observed how it functions in a visit to its newest medical center at Panorama City in southern California's San Fernando Valley. I was so favorably impressed with its fundamental principles, with the cooperative accomplishments of businessmen and independent groups of physicians, and with their mutual philosophy for a private enterprise approach to the problems of providing medical care, that I wish to present this report on its activities.

Six major organizations share the primary responsibility for conducting this program. They are Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, four independent groups of physicians—the Permanente medical groups—and Kaiser Foundation Hospitals.

#### THE KAISER FOUNDATION HEALTH PLAN'S MEMBERSHIP

The health plan is the Nation's largest prepaid direct service medical and hospital care plan, with more than 940,000 members in the Pacific States and Hawaii. Voluntary subscribers may enroll themselves and their dependents either through groups or on an individual family basis. Among its group subscribers are retail clerks, longshoremen and warehousemen, culinary workers, faculty and staff members of educational institutions on all levels of learning, public utilities employees, personnel of Federal, State, and local governments, and employees from a wide variety of industries.



Federal employees and their dependents comprise the largest group with approximately 180,000 members, or nearly 20 percent of the total enrollment. No other group, including Kaiser employees and their dependents, make up more than 5 percent of the total.

The health plan contracts with all subscribers to arrange necessary hospital and professional care on a prepaid basis for themselves and their families. To carry out this commitment, it then contracts with Kaiser Foundation Hospitals for hospital facilities and services, and with one of four independent medical groups for professional services. There is one medical group for each of the program's four autonomous service regions which include the San Francisco Bay area, Metropolitan Los Angeles, and Fontana, the island of Oahu in Hawaii, and the two-State metropolitan area of Portland, Oreg., and Vancouver, Wash.

Here are the program's resources for serving these 940,000 health plan members. The four cooperating medical groups have a total complement of more than 900 physicians representing general practice and all the major specialties of medicine. There are 12 Kaiser Foundation hospitals with a total complement of about 2,200 licensed beds; all 12 are self-supporting, nonprofit community hospitals also serving other doctors and patients in surrounding areas. The medical groups operate about 36 medical office locations. And together, the six organizations have a total nonphysician personnel force of nearly 7,000 men and women including nurses, pharmacists, technicians, administrative personnel, service and maintenance people, and a wide variety of others.

To express these figures another way, for each 10,000 health plan members the program has close to 10 physicians and about 75 people in paramedical and service capacities; and at current cost levels, each 10,000 members require a capital investment of about \$1 million in hospital and medical facilities and equipment.

#### THE PROGRAM'S OBJECTIVE IN PROVIDING MEDICAL CARE

The contracts between the health plan and the medical groups and the hospital organization link these organizations together in pursuing one objective: to provide the public with a comprehensive, high quality medical and hospital care plan on a nonsubsidized and self-sustaining basis, at costs which the average family can afford.

When I visited the program's newest medical center at Panorama City and met with its southern California region's medical and lay management, I wanted to determine their success in reaching this objective. One of the things which interested me was the scope of services that health plan members purchase with their monthly dues.

I was told that each of the program's four regions offers a selection of plans for group enrollment and one plan for individual enrollment. Unlike plans offered by other programs, the scope of services never varies. The only differences are in the monthly dues and

benefits, which are based on local medical economics.

Here is the illustration of the benefits which an employed subscriber and his family receive under one group enrollment plan available in the southern California region:

Unlimited visits to doctors in their offices without supplemental charge; all necessary surgery without supplemental charge, 125 cost-free days of hospitalization per year, with the remaining 240 days at half-rates; special duty nursing in the hospital, if medically required, without charge; all necessary laboratory work, X-rays and physical therapy without supplemental charge; blood on a replacement basis; eye examinations without supplemental charge; doctors' home calls, day or night, at \$5 per call; prenatal and maternity care through the baby's birth for a supplemental charge of \$100, after 10 months of membership; polio benefits; and free ambulance service. In addition, members are protected by a maximum of \$1,000 in indemnity coverage for accidental injury or emergency illness occurring outside the health plan service area. Under this particular group plan, the subscriber pays \$24.85 per month for himself, his wife and his dependents. An individual subscriber in this group would pay \$8.85 for himself, or \$17.70 for himself and his wife.

As Time magazine concluded last September 14 in an article on the Kaiser Foundation medical care program:

And for their money subscribers get more complete protection than is available from most other forms of U.S. medical insurance. In most of the United States, Blue Cross pays only hospital bills and Blue Shield pays only surgeons' fees and some doctors' bills; HIP (the Health Insurance Plan of Greater New York), runner-up to Kaiser as the Nation's biggest prepaid care plan, does not cover hospital bills. Kaiser covers almost everything.

#### THE PROGRAM IS BASED ON FIVE PRINCIPLES

The participating organizations follow five guiding principles in organizing this comprehensive medical care plan: prepayment, group practice, voluntary enrollment, integrated hospital and medical facilities, and preventive medicine.

Prepayment is generally accepted as the only way by which people of moderate means can pay the increasing costs of modern medical care. Prepayment allows individual families to budget for medical care and also spreads the cost of each member's treatment over a large number of persons.

This prepayment principle is found among all voluntary health insurance programs. However, there is one basic difference between direct service prepayment plans—such as Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Group Health Cooperative of Puget Sound, and Group Health Association here in Washington—and the fee-for-service plans such as Blue Cross and Blue Shield. The latter plans collect subscribers' prepayments and then pay claims on the traditional basis of a fee for each service rendered. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, instead of paying providers of services on the traditional fee-for-service basis, employs an entirely different economic approach to

remunerating its contracting hospital and medical organizations.

The health plan collects subscribers' prepayments and then uses these revenues to pay Kaiser Foundation Hospitals and the medical group for providing all necessary hospital and professional services. The medical groups are paid a negotiated amount for each health plan member per month as a regular and stable income, rather than payment on the fee-for-service basis. Kaiser Foundation Hospitals receives its remuneration through a cost reimbursement agreement with the health plan, with contractual payments covering operating costs, amortization of facilities and a modest earnings provision. In this arrangement, both the medical groups and the hospitals share one sound and stable planning base: the health plan's prepaid membership population.

Prepayment coupled this way with direct service actually reverses the traditional economics of medicine. The well health plan member becomes an asset to the participating medical group; the sick member becomes a liability until he regains his health. For physicians associated with this program, the only economical medical care is good medical care.

The next principle is group practice, which again is not unique within the Kaiser Foundation medical-care program. This method of medical organization has long been employed by many of the Nation's leading clinics and medical centers associated with educational and charitable institutions. Under this organization, each doctor in the group practices in the field of medicine in which he has been trained.

The physicians themselves control all professional care, with no lay or corporate interference with their services to, and relationships with, their patients.

Each health plan member is encouraged to choose a personal family physician from among the group's general practitioners or internists. This personally chosen physician directs all phases of the member's medical care, ordering X-rays, and laboratory tests, prescribing medications, and therapy, and referring to other specialists within the group whenever examinations and consultations appear necessary.

The medical groups' pooling and sharing of all income from health plan members and from private and industrial patients creates economic unity within the group, rather than individual economic rivalry.

In the Kaiser Foundation medical-care program, the four cooperating medical groups provide the four cornerstones on which the entire program is built. The medical groups' professional leaders are directly responsible for measuring and controlling the quality of medical care for health plan members, and for maintaining and striving to improve this essential factor of quality.

I talked at considerable length with leaders of the southern California medical group on this point of quality. Their feelings are that quality of care is best

ascertained and controlled by key well-trained physicians working with other members of the medical group in the actual care of patients. Their staffs are organized by services or departments such as internal medicine, surgery, and pediatrics. Each chief of service has the responsibility of constantly reviewing and supervising the medical care practiced by his staff members. Together with keymen on his staff, he establishes a standard of care and then sees that this standard is maintained.

Physicians within the group select new staff members on the basis of training, experience, professional standing, a warm and personal attitude toward patients, and the personal ability to work cooperatively. Both a new staff member and his work are regularly reviewed by the chief of that particular service. Once each year the individual members of all services are discussed formally by their chiefs of service, their medical directors and the medical group's board of directors. After 3 years of such observation, the physicians who meet the medical group's standards are admitted as partners. In this way, group practice effects a potent control on quality.

The third principle—voluntary enrollment—means that each health plan subscriber belongs to the plan by choice. At the beginning of each new contract period, each subscriber has an opportunity to continue membership or choose another plan.

Another aspect of this principle is the concept of dual choice, which was developed and introduced by the Kaiser Foundation Health Plan. It means the health plan does not accept new members through captive groups. Any contracting group such as a labor union, a health and welfare fund or a Government health benefits program must offer its members a choice between the Kaiser Foundation Health Plan and at least one significantly different prepayment program such as an indemnity or service plan. The health plan actually refuses enrollment requests if the interested group does not plan to make arrangements for offering its members a choice of programs.

As I mentioned earlier, there are approximately 180,000 Federal employees and their dependents enrolled in the health plan through the Federal employees' health benefit program. Each of approximately 60,000 Federal employees who enrolled as the health plan subscriber exercised his choice among a number of different plans, including two nationwide programs. I was impressed to learn that among all the programs available to Federal employees, the Kaiser program is the most popular choice in two of its four geographic regions and the second choice in its remaining two regions.

Leaders of this program also point out another aspect of this principle of voluntary enrollment and dual choice: It gives the consumer an opportunity to exercise his opinions, influentially.

Dual choice—or multiple choice—means competition, and competition encourages improvement. By selecting from competing plans and approaches,

the consumers of medical care exercise their influence on the direction of future developments and their judgment as to which types of plans and developments best meet consumer needs.

The fourth principle is that of well-planned, integrated facilities. The program's medical and lay leaders believe that doctors and their patients need to have a central medical center with modern hospital and outpatient facilities and, as needed, outlying satellite medical offices from which patients are referred to this main center.

This principle is readily apparent at the new Kaiser Foundation Hospital and Medical Center which I visited at Panorama City, Calif. This 10-story facility opened last September. Its first three floors, which are rectangular in shape, contain doctors' offices and all the supporting diagnostic services such as laboratory and X-ray. The top seven floors, which are shaped like a pair of binoculars with twin circular wings connected by a vertical column for elevators and other services, contain a hospital with 146 licensed beds and surgery and maternity facilities.

Some 60,000 health plan members in the surrounding San Fernando Valley identify their medical needs with this one central location. Patients are not forced to waste time traveling from one specialist's office location to that of another, or from a doctor's office to an outside laboratory. Doctors caring for critically ill hospitalized patients can attend their outpatients and still remain within close proximity to the hospital room.

And there are advantages in economy, too. When a large group of doctors and a large hospital share the same diagnostic facilities and equipment, there is no need to duplicate these costly items at various locations.

The fifth principle, preventive medical care, is the effort to safeguard health. As I mentioned earlier, prepayment and direct service together reverse the traditional economics of medicine. The doctors and hospitals depend on the total health plan membership for their incomes and not primarily on people who are ill. Thus, the natural desires of physicians and hospital administrators to contribute toward maintaining good health is reinforced by an economic incentive. And with prepayment greatly reducing the economic barriers, health plan members are easily encouraged to obtain diagnosis and treatment early—before a condition becomes severe and more costly, more dangerous and more tragic.

The intriguing thing about these five principles is that none of them were pre-conceived by the program's founders. Each one arose from practical experiences in solving medical care problems in a series of situations.

#### THE FIVE PRINCIPLES EVOLVED OVER 30 YEARS

The first such situation goes back 30 years when a young surgeon named Dr. Sidney R. Garfield organized an industrial medical-care program for workers building the Los Angeles Aqueduct across the southern California desert. His medical group began their program on the traditional fee-for-service basis,

but soon discovered they needed a more stable and adequate method for financing it.

The contractors joined them in persuading insurance carriers to drop fees-for-service in favor of prepayment at a monthly rate of \$1.50 for each employee. This new financial arrangement was such a success that the doctors soon were able to expand the plan to prepaid medical coverage for nonindustrial illness and injuries.

Similar programs later were organized first for Kaiser employees constructing Grand Coulee Dam in 1938 and then for 90,000 warworkers at Kaiser's west coast shipyards and steel mills during World War II. Again these programs proved themselves self-sustaining and financially sound.

Immediately after the war, former war workers and a number of labor unions asked Henry J. Kaiser and the cooperating physicians to open this kind of program to the general public. They decided to accept this new challenge and in 1945 opened health plan enrollment to groups and individuals on a voluntary basis. Then the plan had only about 10,000 members. By the end of 1962, membership stood at 940,000. Within a year, this figure may reach 1 million.

As Henry J. Kaiser told the 83d Congress House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce during its consideration of national health legislation:

The principles of the health plan have been tested under all sorts of conditions—in wartime and in peacetime; through depression, recession and prosperity; in all sorts of locations—in deserts, in remote rural areas, in suburbs and in large cities; in areas with only a small number of members and in other areas with tens of thousands of members; with scattered groups and concentrated groups.

#### PHYSICIANS CONTROL QUALITY OF PATIENT CARE

Actually, I was even more impressed with the program's built-in controls on quality of care than I was with its size or its guiding principles.

While describing the principle of group practice, I mentioned how the cooperating medical groups establish their standard of quality. For maintaining and improving upon this standard, the medical leaders say the development of the individual physician is the major factor. Leaders of the Permanente medical groups say they believe the most important benefit they offer their staff physicians is the opportunity to develop professionally in a manner usually available only in centers for medical education.

Within this program, these opportunities are available both on an informal and formal basis. Informally there are opportunities for physicians to discuss cases with colleagues, to confer with specialists from other services within the group, and to obtain aid or advice from medical education centers in the area, if necessary.

On a formal basis, the four medical groups and Kaiser Foundation Hospitals sponsor continuing programs in education and research, in the interest of better patient care. Doctors in the



major hospitals at San Francisco, Oakland, Los Angeles, and Portland, Oreg., direct and participate in intern or residency programs which are approved by the American Medical Association's Council on Medical Education and Hospitals. A number of physicians from the medical groups hold academic appointments at nearby medical schools and universities such as Stanford, University of California, UCLA, and USC. In addition, the doctors in each hospital organize a number of regularly scheduled medical conferences, teaching sessions and symposia, all of which are also open to attendance by any physician in the community. Any physician on the staff of a Kaiser Foundation hospital may also apply for funds for a clinical research project. Each such application is reviewed by the research committees of the medical groups and Kaiser Foundation Hospitals, which decide whether funds should be made available by the hospital organization.

These activities in education and research, together with the Kaiser Foundation School of Nursing, the Kaiser Foundation Research Institute, and Kaiser Foundation Hospitals' charitable care, constitute the program's community service endeavors. Last year Kaiser Foundation Hospitals expended more than \$1.5 million to support these pursuits and in addition, the research institute received a total of another \$1.5 million in Federal grants for research involving basic sciences related to medicine.

Another significant aspect of quality control in this program is that the medical groups' practices are hospital based. All major Kaiser Foundation hospitals which have been open for the required year are accredited by the joint commission on hospital accreditation, representing the American Hospital Association, the American Medical Association, and the American College of Surgeons. This means the hospitals have voluntarily invited inspection by the commission and have been found to meet its standards for approval. The medical groups believe these standards are important, and their chiefs of services cooperate closely with the hospital administrations in maintaining accreditation requirements.

#### THE ENTIRE PROGRAM IS SELF-SUSTAINING

Another impressive fact is that this entire program is economically self-sustaining.

Looking back 21 years, Mr. Henry J. Kaiser recalls that when he sought the first bank loan to build hospital facilities for his wartime shipyard workers, the bankers told him they "wouldn't loan a dime on a hospital, because hospitals are such money losers." He personally had to guarantee the first hospital construction loan of \$250,000.

Last June, 20 years later, Kaiser Foundation Hospitals completed negotiations for a \$35 million loan from four private financial institutions. This amount refinanced all long-term financial obligations and provided \$16.5 million for development of additional facilities. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan was the only guarantor.

#### THE PROGRAM'S LEADERS ARE SENSITIVE TO COVERAGE GAPS

Despite these successes—in terms of comprehensive coverage and membership growth, construction and financing of new facilities, and organizing quality medical care services—the program's leaders point out a number of problems that still need solution.

Health plan membership is closed in some areas because the program's facilities cannot keep pace with the demand for enrollment. Both physicians and lay management are sensitive to gaps in health plan coverage and are studying ways to fill them.

Significant work is being done in southern California between the medical group and the Retail Clerks Welfare Fund, on a cooperative and demonstrative basis, to determine how best to integrate psychiatric care into the scope of services to health plan members. In Portland, Oreg., limited coverage is now provided for inpatient psychiatric care. Also in Portland, under very recent arrangements, prepayment by health plan members covers a substantial portion of their outpatient drug bills.

In assessing the importance of the Kaiser Foundation medical care program in answering the health care needs of the public, one fact is clearly outstanding: On a private enterprise basis, dedicated physicians and farsighted businessmen are pooling their talents in efficiently organizing the complex resources of modern medical care to serve a population now greater in number than the populations of each of 13 States in our Nation.

Edgar F. Kaiser, president of Kaiser Foundation Hospitals and Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, says this about the program:

Among all the activities which my father has organized and stimulated, the one he views with greatest pride is the Kaiser Foundation medical care program. The program's antecedents began because we had a need we could not fill. Doctors, nurses, and other members of the health professions responded by joining with us to form a relationship from which has evolved our present-day program. Together with independent groups of dedicated physicians for whom there is no substitute, this program answers expressed health care needs of the public in the true spirit of the free enterprise system, under which the financing and organization of medical care may be met by diverse approaches.

#### A RECORD VOTE ON ALL SPENDING BILLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PELL. Mr. Speaker, this week the House considered its first appropriation bill. This was House Joint Resolution 284, making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963. The amount of taxpayers' money involved was \$503 million.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say first that when it came to the vote on final passage of the resolution, I asked, and the House sustained my request, for the vote to be taken by "yeas" and "nays".

I sought this record vote in line with the firm belief that there should be a record of how all Members vote on all appropriations bills. In other words, Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that in the balance of this session, the House will support me in trying to get record votes on all spending bills.

If this can be done, Mr. Speaker, then an analysis can be made of individual voting. Such an analysis would show the Members who consistently vote for larger appropriations and then, quite inconsistently, vote against such legislation as an increase in the national debt ceiling. Certainly if Members help to create an increase in the national debt, in all honesty they should be willing to vote for an increase in the legal limit. The record should be such as to allow the press to point up such inconsistencies.

This year, with the first planned deficit budget of an administration that I can recall, with an administration proposal calling for greatly increased expenditures, and with a proposed loss of revenue through a cut in taxation, priority, of course, will have to be given by the President to legislation that will raise the national debt ceiling.

As for me, Mr. Speaker, I voted last year against an increase in the debt ceiling to \$308 billion, just as I did before that. According to Treasury estimates, the national debt stands at about \$302 billion. Furthermore, under the present law, the debt ceiling will drop to \$305 billion on "April Fool's Day," then in turn to \$300 billion on June 25, and to \$285 billion on July 1.

The administration has known all along that we were facing this situation. The President could have called for a curb in spending in order not to bring about this present emergency and thereby avoided the need to continue the \$308 billion limit. I see no way to exert pressure for economy other than to refuse to go along, and instead to vote down the bill to authorize the debt ceiling increase.

Mr. Speaker, some people say we do not need any debt ceiling. Such individuals completely overlook the fact that at the moment there is authorization under back-door spending programs for the agencies of Government to borrow from the Treasury and spend without any appropriation legislation a total of about \$28 billion. The only assurance Congress has that Government agencies will not borrow all this money and spend it without coming to Congress is the legal debt ceiling, and I for one see no method of bringing about fiscal control or responsible economic policies other than to maintain a debt ceiling.

To return, however, to the subject of the \$503 million supplemental appropriation, during consideration of this resolution, I inquired as to how much of this \$508 million impairment in the Commodity Credit Corporation funds was due to shipment of surplus commodities to Communist Poland and Communist Yugoslavia. I could not get a precise answer, but I was informed that since the program began in 1954, around \$900 million worth of commodities have been supplied to Yugoslavia

under the Public Law 480 program, and some \$590 million worth of commodities under this law have been supplied to Poland.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the huge deficit of the Federal Government and the reason for the administration's request for an increase in the debt ceiling is substantially the result of a policy of aiding and feeding the Communists. Those who embrace the very philosophy of the international conspiracy to destroy our freedoms are the ones who have been aided. These deficits have been making communism succeed. These deficit dollars have been going to a nation that has loaned money to Cuba and helped Castro build a Communist beachhead in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the start, I expect to try to obtain a record vote on every appropriations bill that comes up in this session. Then, I hope someone will analyze this record and find out who are the Members of Congress who are supporting the vast expenditures which are creating our huge debt and furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I hope the analysis will show the Members who vote the dollars that go to help the slave world try to destroy the free world. It is about time that the American people be given the facts. Let the record show just which Members of the House are the ones who are responsible for the vast public debt and what the money is spent for. It is time someone did some fingerprinting. Too many spending bills have been by voice votes with no showing as to how individuals vote on these measures.

#### CIVIL RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, at long last the President today sent a message to Congress recommending some legislation and outlining prospective Executive action in the field of civil rights. In the preamble to this message the President says that his administration has done more in the field of civil rights than any other administration in our Nation's history.

Since I am the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary, which has had responsibility in this field for many years, I am forced to take issue with that statement and to say that there is no unanimity concerning that claim by the President.

I would like to remind the House that in the last term of the Eisenhower administration, in 1957 and in 1960, far-reaching civil rights legislation was passed. I am sure that those who are without prejudice will admit that that legislation is the most effective legislation in the field of civil rights since the days of the Carpetbaggers.

In addition, during President Eisenhower's term in office the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunities was given its principal impetus. Furthermore, the beginning of real, effective school desegregation oc-

curred in the Eisenhower administration following the 1954 Supreme Court decision.

In addition, the action to eliminate discrimination in transportation first became effective in the Eisenhower administration.

I am sure that those of you who were in the armed services within the last two decades know that desegregation in the Armed Forces occurred during the Truman administration. And I am also sure that those of you who were in Washington from 1950 to 1960 know that in the Nation's Capital desegregation had its first effective help in the Eisenhower administration.

As a matter of fact, more effective civil rights legislation was enacted in the 8 years of the Eisenhower administration than has been enacted in all the years since the death of that great President, Abraham Lincoln.

In large part, the President now recommends legislation much like, but not nearly as broad in scope, the civil rights legislation which was introduced by a score or more of the minority Members of the House on the 31st day of January of this year.

I particularly note in section 1 of the President's message that the right to vote is discussed at some length, but there is a singular omission in that section of his message to the Congress. Of course, every qualified American should have the right to vote, and he should be able to freely exercise it, without discrimination, in accordance with the laws of the State in which he resides; but of equal importance, if not of greater importance, is the right of every citizen to have his vote properly counted or to prevent citizens who are not qualified to vote for one reason or another, even by death, from having such votes counted.

Mr. Speaker, I refer to news story after news story in the press and on the air concerning illegal voting and the illegal counting of votes in elections in recent years in Philadelphia, in Chicago, in Detroit, and in certain political subdivisions in Texas.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Florida, one of the able members of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, and for the purpose of the RECORD, and I think the gentleman will confirm it, I should say that it was 2 years ago that the Committee on the Judiciary in considering the extension of the Civil Rights Commission voted out by a very substantial majority the specific provision to which the gentleman is now referring that has been omitted from the administration's proposal, and that is that the right not only of a person to vote but to have that vote counted should be within the jurisdiction of the Civil Rights Commission to investigate and make recommendations on, adding that as a subject matter within its jurisdiction. I am sure the gentleman recalls that.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I do recall it, and I am very happy to say that the gentle-

man from Florida wrote the original proposal that was submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary and he made a successful fight to have that proposal in the bill which we considered. It is regrettable that it was not enacted into law.

Mr. CRAMER. The reason for my offering such an amendment arises from the fact that, by appointment of the Speaker, I, for two sessions now have served—at that time one session—on the special Subcommittee on Campaign Expenditures and Elections; and I came to the very definite conclusion that the major shenanigan in voting in America is that votes cast often are not properly counted or are not counted at all.

Numerous instances that have been documented, including events during the last presidential election, I think clearly show that. The objective of this amendment was to make sure that the right of the citizen to have his vote counted, which is of equal importance with the right of the vote itself, be preserved.

I am sure the gentleman is also familiar with the fact that the majority turned handsprings, speaking procedurally, to keep that amendment which was voted out of the committee from ever being considered on the floor of this House in that the other body, to avoid that amendment, to avoid a vote on it on the floor of the House, put its own extension of the Commission bill as a rider on a totally unrelated appropriation bill for the Justice Department and sent it over and made the House accept it without the right-to-have-the-votes-counted amendment which affects all people, including the majority as well as the minority. That was certainly a backhanded way of preventing the House of Representatives from voting on what I think is one of the crucial questions in connection with the right to vote, to have the vote counted of both the majority and all minorities. Does not the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the comments of the gentleman from Florida. It is regrettable, indeed, that that provision is not now the law of the land. Before we leave that subject, I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, when we are talking about public images, I do not know what can give us a blacker and a darker image in the eyes of the people of the rest of the world that are struggling so hard for the elective franchise than to hear it charged in responsible publications and news media of every kind that votes are being illegally cast in this great country and that some votes that are properly cast are being either not counted or illegally counted.

Now I yield to my good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN].

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio is making a contribution to truth in his statement today. I would like to ask the gentleman, since the President is taking all the credit for all civil rights advances: Was it not during the Truman administration that Mr. Ralph Bunche was offered a position in the administration, but he refused it



because he said Negroes were not comfortable in living quarters in Washington, D.C.?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I do have a recollection that that statement was made.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Is it not true under President Eisenhower's administration, hotels and restaurants were desegregated in the District of Columbia by Executive order?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Yes, of course; 3 or 4 years ago, I attended a dinner at the Willard Hotel to which were invited some of the leading business and political leaders, including Negroes, of this country. One of the leaders of the majority in the other body spoke and said there has been more progress made in desegregation in the District of Columbia in the last half decade than in all the history of the District theretofore. I was about to give the name and the date, but that detail is unnecessary.

I should like to say, that Ohio has no voter qualifications which seek to prevent or which do prevent people from voting, who meet the residence qualification. Any person 21 years of age, and under no legal restraint and who has lived within the State for 1 year and within the political subdivision for 40 days may vote. We have had no election scandals in Ohio for more than a third of a century when that able, effective, and courageous secretary of state, Clarence J. Brown was in, large part, responsible for indictments and trials and convictions for violation of the election laws in my State.

I am further disturbed by the failure of the President to make recommendations to end conditions which exist in discrimination in employment by those who have authority in the labor movement in America. While the right to vote and to help select people to represent one is of great importance, the opportunity to get a job and earn one's bread by the sweat of one's brow is even more important and more basic than the right to help select public officers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Maryland who has been so active—so constructively active and interested in this subject.

Mr. MATHIAS. I think the gentleman is touching upon one of the most significant failures in the civil rights message. Certainly, if one holds in one hand a copy of the message and in the other hand a copy of the Democratic platform of 1960, what has been sent to the Congress today can be viewed only as a retreat. It is an ironic fact that the Washington Post and Times Herald for today has a story on the front page which is headlined "Race Barrier Still a Factor in Jobs Here." This news story appears the very day that a Presidential message comes to the Congress which has repudiated the many repeated promises made on this subject and which offers neither help nor hope for relief in this important area of discrimination in employment. In contrast to the weakness of the President's message in proposing measures to safeguard equality of opportunity for employment, the bill introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio and by other Republican

members of the Judiciary Committee would make a real contribution.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy that the gentleman from Maryland has made that comment. I can with good grace say to the House that the civil rights bill which the gentleman from Maryland introduced contains a section which would remedy the thing that is so distasteful to so many.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York who also has been so interested and active in the field of civil rights.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank my distinguished friend, the ranking minority member of our committee, for yielding to me. He has shown great leadership in proposing a comprehensive meaningful civil rights bill which I and others were privileged to cosponsor with him on January 31.

I suppose we have embarrassed the administration somewhat, because I am happy to see that some parts of the bill which a group of us on the minority side of the Judiciary Committee proposed have been included in the President's message that was sent to the House today. Although I am gratified to that extent, I am disappointed and amazed that the President would send up such a thin proposal and ask the Congress to act only on that proposal.

This is a retreat; and is in effect an invitation to legislative catastrophe in the civil rights area. I cannot help noting at the same time that the message is accompanied by a good deal of propaganda. I wonder if poor Abe Lincoln is not turning in his grave a little bit as I read this sentence in the President's message:

In the last 2 years more progress has been made in securing civil rights for Americans than in any comparable period of our history.

That is quite a statement, and I would have thought that the drafters of that statement would have thought twice before putting it in, because at the end of the message the President asks that there be no partisan consideration, that there be no disagreement, and that we just accept this meager proposal as it stands.

I take note also that it was under the Eisenhower administration that the lead was taken in ending segregation practices and discrimination in interstate transportation, land and air; yet that credit is magnanimously assumed by Mr. Kennedy. The Eisenhower administration also took the lead in ending desegregation for the District of Columbia.

So I think that we on the minority side owe it to the public and owe it to ourselves as members of the minority to call for an accounting on statements of this kind.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I certainly agree with my colleague from New York, and that is the reason why earlier today I asked for this 30-minute special order that we might discuss the matter. From a hurried reading of the message, it appears to fall far short of the Democratic platform on the subject, adopted at the convention in which the

President was nominated. On the other hand, the bill which the gentleman from New York had so much part in preparing carries forward, in substance, the Republican platform.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield further to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. The Democratic platform of 1960 specifically states that the Civil Rights Commission should be made a permanent commission, yet the proposal sent to us today in this message calls for only a 4-year extension.

Mr. McCULLOCH. The gentleman's bill likewise provides for a permanent commission. A permanent commission in this field is needed.

Mr. LINDSAY. And with proper subpoena powers.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Yes.

Mr. LINDSAY. One reason we know this is important is that contrary to what is stated in the President's message, the problem of civil rights in securing for all citizens equal opportunity under the law is a continuing one which is not going to be solved in 4 years; it will not be solved in 24 years. In order to have a proper Civil Rights Commission examining into the problems, it must be permanent. We are going to have continuing difficulty in securing truly qualified men to serve on such a commission on a temporary year-to-year basis.

The 1960 Democratic platform also calls for providing governmental authority to institute a civil action in a Federal court.

This proposal is not even mentioned in the message. Our bill, the bill introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCulloch] contains this provision in the field of education, which is the most critical area.

A third area where the Democratic platform is breached by this message is in the area of employment practices. A Federal FEPC was promised in the platform. No mention of it was made in the message.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Would not the gentleman agree that the denial of the opportunity to earn a living by reason of race or color is one of the most troublesome and inexcusable discriminations with which we are faced?

Mr. LINDSAY. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. McCULLOCH. It is basic?

Mr. LINDSAY. It is basic. It should be pointed out that the bill the gentleman offered to the Congress contains a provision setting up a Federal commission on a permanent basis that has power to make surveys, and to bring cases in this area involving discrimination in connection with Government contracts, in the great complex where the Government cooperates with private industry and universities to forward the defense of America. This is the area we propose to do something about.

May I say that I have no intention of being partisan on this issue, and I hope we will not force ourselves into a partisan angle, but it is difficult to remain

silent in view of statements made in this message.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I interrupt the gentleman from New York to say in view of the fact some 80 or 90 new Federal judges have been appointed, the court calendars in most of the Federal district courts should be kept current.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to compliment the gentleman from Ohio for his many contributions throughout the years to the solution of the problems in the field of civil rights.

I note on page 6 of the message of the President these words:

Beginning in September of this year, under the aid-to-impacted-area school program, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will initiate a program of providing on-base facilities so that children living on military installations will no longer be required to attend segregated schools at Federal expense.

My question to the gentleman from Ohio is this: There is nothing in the bill which the gentleman and other Republican Members introduced that would perpetuate school segregation by building integrated schools on military installations?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Of course not. I am happy that question has been asked, in view of the language in the President's message.

Mr. SHRIVER. Would not such a plan result in actually rewarding local school districts for noncompliance with our Constitution?

Mr. McCULLOCH. Yes, it would. I think those who joined in introducing the bill of the minority, would have no part in such proposals.

Mr. SHRIVER. Is it the gentleman's understanding that the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People is very much against this proposition?

Mr. McCULLOCH. That is my understanding.

Mr. SHRIVER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I should like to most sincerely commend the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] as well as the gentlemen who have participated with him in this discussion of the merits of the civil rights legislation introduced by many of us last month, and the lack of merit in the President's message given to the Congress today.

In noting the superficial nature of the proposals contained in the Presidential message, the thought occurs to the gentleman from Minnesota that there must be some understanding between powerful congressional Members of the

President's party and the drafters of this message; how else does one account for the serious deficiencies and oversights in the legislation requested by the White House? For example, there is nothing in the Presidential message calling for added legislative tools to eliminate discrimination in employment opportunities.

I cannot let this day go by without suggesting that considerations of political expediency, and the plans going forward for the 1964 campaign, have been more evident in the content of this message than the expected sincere desire to advance the cause of civil rights in America.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

At this point I would like to comment upon a statement that was made by my colleague from New York who said that he hoped legislation in this field would not take on partisan political attributes. I, too, hope that there is no partisanship in the consideration of this legislation either in committee or on the floor of the House or in the other body.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCULLOCH. I am pleased to yield to my good friend from Iowa [Mr. BROMWELL].

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, let me join my colleagues here in congratulating the gentleman from Ohio in his anticipation of sound civil rights legislation over a month ago in the introduction of a sound civil rights bill.

Apropos the most recent remark of the gentleman about partisan political considerations I, too, am in hopes that partisanship can be avoided and that a sound bill will be enacted very swiftly. Here is a situation where all that is needed is a minority of the majority to put good civil rights legislation on the books. I think the expression has been made abundantly in this session from this side of the aisle, that the only thing that is needed for some decent legislation is cooperation from the other side. I would, however, like to make one statement, which I cannot forbear making—I made it substantially a month ago when the civil rights bills were introduced from this side of the aisle—and it is brought to mind by the reference to the poll tax amendment in the message we received today. I think that it cannot be pointed out too often to the people of the United States, or too vigorously, that the poll tax amendment is a glittering political fraud, that no one has so far voted because of its adoption after a full 40 minutes of debate in this House, that no one has yet voted; 13 States have ratified and we have some 25 to go and when they get done, it is still a question whether anybody will vote, because it applies only to Federal elections and Federal officers, who are on the same ballot with State officials, to vote for which poll taxes have to be paid. I think we should deemphasize the poll tax amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] has expired.

## CUBA SITUATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, as a new Member of the Congress, I have refrained from taking the time of the Members of this House until today. I would have hoped that the occasion of my first remarks could have been one of less urgency and of less danger to this Nation than the increasingly critical problem of Cuba.

As many Members of the House, I have been anxiously hoping that the administration would, after weighing all of the various alternatives, assume the advantage we seemingly held some months ago and have since lost, by stepping forward in a capacity of leadership, and, with the cooperation of the other nations in this hemisphere to the greatest extent possible, by undertaking a positive course of action aimed at preventing the strengthening of the Castro regime, stopping the further spread of communism from Cuba to other nations of this hemisphere, and hopefully accelerating the eventual elimination of communism from Cuba. Regrettably, this has not happened.

Personally, as serious as these questions may be, I have been less concerned of late with debating the exact number of missiles or Communist troops remaining in Cuba, or the often obscure distinction between offensive and defensive weapons, or even the exact meaning of a so-called bipartisan foreign policy, than with the very real danger which Cuba represents to this hemisphere as a training ground and stepping off point for Communist guerrillas, saboteurs, and infiltrators. Certainly, recent developments in Brazil dramatize this problem. We cannot tolerate four or five South Vietnams in this hemisphere.

I rise today to call to the attention of my colleagues some shocking facts concerning the dramatically increased trade between Cuba and Communist-bloc nations, particularly Red China, and to point out that much of this cargo, which serves to strengthen the Castro regime in Cuba and to assist Cuba in its subversive activities, is being moved through our own Panama Canal.

The 1962 annual report of the Board of Directors of the Panama Canal Company states on page 6:

The volume of cargo moving through the canal to Red China in 1962 totaled 877,000 long tons, for an increase of 600 percent, and movements to Russia totaled 344,000 long tons, for an increase of 48 percent.

While this is shocking to me, it apparently is not of great concern to the administration, in that the president of the Panama Canal Company, and, incidentally, the Company is a corporate agency and instrumentality of the Government of the United States, stated in



his 1962 letter to the stockholder—the stockholder being the Honorable Cyrus Vance, Secretary of the Army:

It is gratifying to report that a record volume of traffic moved through the Panama Canal last year, reflecting the canal's expanding role of world oceanborne commerce.

I, for one, do not consider an increase of 600 percent in cargo movements to Red China through the Panama Canal gratifying. The report points out that sugar movements from Cuba accounted for a major portion of the increased combined tonnage to Red China and Russia through the canal. The report goes on to say:

Thus, cargo movements during 1962 marked another year in the continued phenomenal growth in world traffic since World War II.

Mr. Speaker, I am writing today to the President of the United States, expressing my concern and asking a series of four questions regarding the advisability of the United States extending the recently announced policy of denying the use of U.S. ports to ships trading with Cuba to include the ports at either end of the Panama Canal. I wish to insert my letter to the President in the RECORD at this point:

FEBRUARY 28, 1963.

THE PRESIDENT,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am deeply concerned by the dramatically increased cargo movements through the Panama Canal to Red China during 1962 as reported in the 1962 Annual Report of the Panama Canal Company. Certainly the restrictions which the United States has imposed on trade with Cuba represent an attempt by this country to weaken the Castro regime. This obviously is and must be our goal. In that the increased trade between Communist-bloc nations and Cuba is defeating this goal, it seems obvious that serious consideration should be given to the possibility of a move by the United States to deny the use of the Panama Canal to all ships carrying cargo into and out of Communist Cuba.

In the event that existing treaties and international agreements prevent such action, it would further seem feasible that this Nation give immediate consideration to the possibility of a revision of the treaties and international agreements involved to adapt them to the cold war being fought in this hemisphere in 1963.

The danger of the establishment of a Communist dictatorship on the continent of South America which is posed by the continued exportation of communism from Cuba to the continent is serious. Today the Panama Canal could serve as an effective tool in preventing the strengthening of the Castro regime and the further spread of communism to the continent. At the point where a Communist dictatorship is established on the continent of South America, control of the Panama Canal will cease in large measure to be an effective tool in preventing the further spread of communism.

For your consideration and response, I am attaching a series of four questions which are of grave concern to me. I will look forward to your early reply.

Sincerely,

DONALD RUMSFELD,  
Member of Congress.

#### QUESTIONS SUBMITTED

1. Would existing U.S. treaties and/or international agreements permit a move by the United States to deny the use of the

Panama Canal to ships carrying cargo into and out of Cuba?

2. What are the restrictions contained in the recent administration statement limiting the use of "American ports" under certain circumstances by certain vessels?

3. Could the facilities, whether they be called harbors, ports, or entrances at both ends of the Panama Canal be considered American ports for the purposes of international agreements, treaties, and the recently established policy referred to above?

4. Since the rise of the Castro regime in Cuba, the United States has taken various steps to weaken that regime including restrictions on trade between this country and Communist Cuba. To offset the desired harmful effects on the Cuban economy as the result of these U.S. actions, the Communist bloc nations, particularly Red China, have substantially increased their trading activities with Cuba. In view of these facts and in view of the events in the past 5 months, would it not be appropriate for this Nation to impose a restriction on the use of the Panama Canal by any ships carrying cargo to or from Cuba?

Problems are not solved by pretending that they do not exist. Certainly the continued delay in commencing a coordinated hemispheric action will reduce our chances for success in stemming the tide of world communism. Once the Communists have established a firm beachhead on the continent of South America, we will have lost the advantage which our control of the Panama Canal today represents and with it the opportunity to prevent the continued spread of communism throughout this hemisphere. Today, the Panama Canal can be an effective tool against communism; tomorrow, it may not.

To my knowledge, this question was first raised in two articles appearing in the Chicago Sun-Times during the past week. For the benefit of those who share my concern, I wish to insert the following articles from the Chicago Sun-Times in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks: A syndicated column by Milburn P. Akers, of Friday, February 22, an editorial advocating that this Nation deny the use of the Panama Canal to all ships carrying cargo into and out of Communist Cuba, of February 22. The syndicated column of Milburn P. Akers which I understand has been distributed for publication in the Chicago Sun-Times on March 1, also deals with this problem and I intend to insert it in the RECORD as soon as copies are available.

I wish to point out that our policy of denying the use of U.S. ports, or even a step to deny the use of the Panama Canal to Communist vessels engaged in trade with Cuba, will not solve the problem, in that a major portion of these cargoes move on vessels flying non-Communist flags.

Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting an invasion of Cuba; I am not suggesting a full blockade of Cuba; I am not rattling sabers; rather, I am urging the administration to take cognizance of this dramatically increased Communist trade through the Panama Canal. I am requesting and urging that the appropriate committee of the House of Representatives conduct an investigation as to the advisability of a move by the United States to deny the use of the Panama Canal to all ships carrying cargo into

and out of Cuba. If under existing treaties and international agreements this cannot be accomplished, and I fully appreciate that there are obstacles including treaties with both Panama and Great Britain, I am asking that consideration be given to prompt revision of these treaties or agreements to adapt them to cope with the cold war we are fighting in this hemisphere in 1963. Certainly if such course of action is deemed advisable, the necessary changes could be accomplished. If at the conclusion of these studies it is the decision of the House to express to the President the sense of the House that these or similar steps be taken, I strongly urge that every effort be made to encourage the cooperation of the other nations of this hemisphere through the Organization of American States.

I wish also to include at the conclusion of my remarks pages 4, 5, and 6 from the 1962 Panama Canal annual report of the board of directors:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Feb. 22, 1963]

(By Milburn P. Akers)

Total isolation of Fidel Castro's Cuba by the remaining Western Hemisphere nations has been proposed by President Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela.

This step, effectively enforced, would help. But it isn't enough. Cuba should be isolated by the entire free world. So long as the Castro regime remains in power, Cuba's potential for mischief, or worse, remains.

The United States risked atomic war to force Soviet Russia to withdraw its missiles. It is now treading on risky ground in efforts to bring about the removal of remaining Soviet troops. Even after these troops are removed, as they probably will be shortly, Cuba under Castro remains as a threat—a threat not so much to the United States, which if need be, can overrun Cuba at will, but to Latin America generally.

Cuba is being used as a training ground for saboteurs, guerrillas and other varieties of Communist troublemakers from various Latin American nations. If that is permitted to continue, the United States, sooner or later, will be fighting many dirty, little wars in Latin America as it is now doing in South Vietnam. Twelve thousand American soldiers and much equipment are now employed in South Vietnam in the effort to eradicate relatively small bands of Viet Congs, that nation's equivalent of Communist guerrillas. The United States is spending a minimum of \$500 million annually in this effort alone.

Do we want to do the same thing in half a dozen or more Latin American nations?

Ridding Cuba of Soviet missiles and troops isn't enough. Castro and the Communist regime on that island are the real culprits. The missiles and troops wouldn't have been in Cuba except for Castro and his regime. They were brought into Cuba surreptitiously in the first place. They can be returned in the same manner so long as Cuba has a Communist government.

Neither the Kennedy administration nor most of its Republican opposition is taking or advocating those steps, short of invasion, which would eradicate the infection at its source. Total isolation of Cuba by the free world might do the job.

Total isolation would mean that no citizen of the free world would be permitted to travel to Cuba; that no person, company, or cartel would engage in any kind of traffic whatsoever with Cuba.

Various nations whose own security is totally dependent upon the atomic capability of the United States hesitated or refused to

ban commerce with Cuba previously. Even the United States hasn't sought to plug all Cuban supply sources in this country. The Kennedy administration acted courageously and effectively in forcing Soviet Russia to remove its missiles. Otherwise its course insofar as Cuba is concerned has been one of timidity, expediency and sheer bubble-headedness.

So long as the United States itself fails to follow policies resulting in an effective total ban on all commerce and travel with Cuba by American citizens and American companies, other free world countries cannot be expected to do so.

Once the United States has instituted such policies most others in the Western Hemisphere can be expected to follow suit. Once the Western Hemisphere has demonstrated it is taking effective steps to rid Cuba of its Communist regime other nations in the free world may do likewise.

It becomes increasingly apparent that the Communist planners, having a foothold in Cuba, intend to use it as a training ground for hordes of guerrillas and saboteurs who will turn many Latin American nations into South Vietnam. Our experience in South Vietnam demonstrates the difficulties such guerrilla bands can create as well as the cost, both in lives and in money, in efforts to rid a nation of them.

It was good to rid Cuba of Soviet missiles. It will be good to rid Cuba of Soviet troops. It will be even better to rid Cuba of Castro and his Communist regime. Without them, there could have been neither Soviet missiles nor troops. With them, we are constantly confronted with a possible return. And with them, we are confronted with the possibility of many dirty, little wars throughout Latin America.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Feb. 26, 1963]

#### TAKE OFF THE GLOVES

Sixty-two Americans have been killed in the abortive fighting in Vietnam. The latest to die is a U.S. Army machinegunner who was killed when two Army helicopters were downed by ground fire while they were carrying out a medical evacuation mission 100 miles east of Saigon.

To check this mounting casualty list an order has been given to allow our troops to open fire first, "in some cases." The criterion is that the American soldier must pick for a target a "positively identified" guerrilla.

This is a specious order. It is inconceivable that a trained Army machinegunner, sitting exposed and naked to ground fire in the open door of a helicopter, would wait to be fired upon before he opened fire. If he did not immediately rake any enemy area where he detected movement before he was fired upon he would not be worthy of the training he had received. Death is as final to a soldier in a political action as it is in a formally declared war.

The relaxing of the "Rules of engagement" (State Department terminology for as yet undeclared warfare) does have a major significance, however.

We have now declared war in Vietnam. Our troops can fire as soon as they identify armed guerrillas as the target. This is war; pure and simple. The line has been drawn in the dust with the heavy toe of a military boot. If you see the enemy—shoot to kill.

There has been an overabundance of political falderal and shilly-shallying in Vietnam and other areas. We are not at war, but our troops have been shooting at an "enemy." We are not at war, but the survivors of those killed in action in Vietnam have been accorded full survivor's benefits consistent with those awarded during a formal conflict.

Now we must buckle down to the difficult and onerous task of driving the enemy—

and there is only one enemy, communism—out of southeast Asia.

As a matter of cold fact, it is high time we take off our velvet gloves and stop worrying about offending Russia. The Russian troops in Cuba must go, whether they go in response to a formal protest from our State Department (and no such protest has yet been lodged, so far as anyone knows) or whether they go because we threaten to drive them out.

In Cuba the Red cancer grows. Now Senator DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois, normally a careful and precise man in his public utterances of import, says that four Americans died in invasion aircraft during the Bay of Pigs fiasco.

It is not known, yet, whether these four men were members of our military forces. The management of news about Cuba has been shocking and calloused beyond recall. It does not matter a great deal—they were Americans and Senator DIRKSEN takes proper umbrage in protesting the remark of Senator JOHN STENNIS, Democrat, of Mississippi, that the Bay of Pigs affair is "spilled milk."

Cuba must be isolated and removed as a mounting platform for armed subversion of Latin America. As Milburn P. Akers, editor of the Sun-Times, noted in his column Friday: "Communist planners, having a foothold in Cuba, intend to use it as a training ground for hordes of guerrillas and saboteurs who will turn many Latin American countries into South Vietnam."

We must not only blockade Cuba—we must also deny the use of the Panama Canal to all ships carrying cargo into and out of Communist Cuba.

Let there be an end to this defeatist philosophy of fearing to offend Russia. When Russia is confronted with the harsh fact that the game is up—as they were confronted in Cuba on October 22—they follow the only course open to them if they hope to survive; they back down.

There will be some who will call this course of confrontation jingoism. There are always those who choose to believe a bully can be won over with soft talk and sweet reason.

Jingoism is an outdated word. A better name is self-preservation.

#### PANAMA CANAL COMPANY REPORT

Subject: Annual report of Board of Directors. Letter to stockholder:

It is very gratifying to report that a record volume of traffic moved through the Panama Canal last year reflecting the canal's expanding role in the steady growth of world ocean-borne commerce. The average time spent by ships in Canal Zone waters during transit was reduced to 15.5 hours, compared with 16.5 hours per transit in 1961. This 1 hour reduction in transit time represents a savings of approximately \$1 million to our customers.

Waterway improvements progressed on schedule during 1962, and the final contract in the channel widening program will be awarded within the next year.

For the 11th successive year since its reorganization (July 1, 1951), the Panama Canal financed within its resources, and without cost to the taxpayer, all of its operational and capital requirements.

The capital program required expenditures of \$16.1 million during the fiscal year. This was the second highest annual expenditure of this nature since the reorganization. The largest single item of capital expenditure was \$5.9 million toward widening of the Empire Reach within Gaillard Cut. In the 5 years through fiscal year 1962, a total of \$22.8 million has been expended for the channel improvement program and additional expenditures necessary to complete this program will approximate \$20.9 million. Other major expenditures in 1962 included \$2.3 million on the quarters replacement program, \$1.3 million for an additional electric

generating plant, \$0.6 million on the central air-conditioning plant, and \$0.5 million on the new locks towing locomotives.

The funds provided through operations, net revenue, depreciation, etc., were not sufficient to finance capital expenditures and it became necessary to draw down cash reserves to the extent of \$1.7 million.

Tolls revenue was at an alltime high of \$58.3 million, for transiting 11,340 ships over 300 tons. Comparatively figures for 1961 were \$55.2 million and 11,054 ships. The average cost to the shipper per cargo ton was 74.9 cents (excludes vessels transiting in ballast or measured on displacement basis), as compared to 74.8 cents for the previous year. The tolls rate remains unchanged at 90 cents per laden ton under Panama Canal measurement.

On June 29, 1962, the SS *Ancon* was transferred to the U.S. Maritime Administration, Department of Commerce, on a nonreimbursable basis, for ultimate transfer to the State of Maine. Consequently, the equity of the U.S. Government in the Company was reduced some \$2 million.

Special emphasis has been given to equality of treatment of all employees. Several programs have been initiated to improve communications with our Spanish-speaking employees as well as our neighbors in the Republic of Panama.

(By order of the Board of Directors.)

ROBERT J. FLEMING, Jr.,  
President.

#### CANAL TRAFFIC

Demands for Panama Canal services established new high records for the year. Ocean-going transits increased by 2.6 percent, cargo tonnage by 6 percent, and tolls income by 5.8 percent over the previous record year of 1961. The flags of some 38 nations of the world were represented by the 11,149 commercial transits. Ranked in the order of their transit volume were the flags of the United States, Norway, Great Britain, Germany, and Liberia. Russian ships in trade with Cuba made 12 transits. The average tonnage of transiting commercial vessels increased by 3 percent. The number of large ships with beams of 80 feet and over increased by 6 percent.

Of the 67,525,000 long tons of commercial cargo that passed through the waterway, 96.5 percent originated in or was destined to one of the nations of North, South, or Central America. Some 22,189,000 long tons of U.S. exports, 17,689,000 tons of U.S. imports, and 5,562,000 tons of cargo moving in the U.S. intercoastal trade passed through the canal.

The flow of cargo to the Far East continued to dominate canal traffic growth as it has for the past 3 years. Commercial cargo movements increased 3,855,000 long tons over last year, of which 3,321,000 long tons was increased flow to the Far East. Cargo movements to Japan alone increased 2,700,000 tons. Japan's industrial boom has been reflected in canal traffic. The beginning of the current expansion phase occurred in 1959 when 7,973,000 long tons of cargo passed through the canal to Japan. This year 16,504,000 long tons moved to Japan. Some slowing in the rapid rate of growth in cargo movements to Japan occurred in late fiscal year 1962. Showing a very impressive percentage increase for the year was the volume of cargo moving to Red China and Russia. Cargo movements to Red China totaled 877,000 long tons for an increase of 600 percent and movements to Russia totaled 344,000 long tons for an increase of 48 percent. Sugar movements from Cuba accounted for the vast majority of this combined tonnage. In the return flow of cargo, Red China and Russia shipped 52,000 tons of cargo to Cuba.

Thus cargo movements during 1962 marked another year in the continued phenomenal growth that has occurred in canal traffic since World War II. During this 16-year period, commercial cargo movements have



increased 212 percent, an annual average increase of 7.5 percent. Only 1958 failed to surpass the previous year in total tonnage movements.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BELL. I would like to commend the gentleman from Illinois on his first speech in the House of Representatives and for his very fine and astute analysis of problems of such importance as this.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I thank my colleague.

Mr. McCLOREY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCLOREY. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman from Illinois in the very excellent presentation he has made to the House today and also to suggest that each and every suggestion and warning and advice that can emanate from this House which may help in the solution of the very tense international situation primarily in the area of Cuba is a contribution to the Nation. This important message that we have had today from the gentleman from Illinois is along that line and contributes to that end. He has made a suggestion which provides a forceful and yet a non-belligerent method of helping to resolve this difficult problem. I compliment the gentleman on the research and study that has evidently gone into the preparation of his remarks. I am confident that the Executive will want to take very careful note of the suggestions and recommendations that have been made. Also, Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the gentleman in the presentation which was given to the House today.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I thank my colleague.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUMSFELD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois, my colleague.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentleman for his remarks here this afternoon. The gentleman is my neighbor to the north and it is certainly a pleasure to see him deliver his maiden speech today in the fine manner that he did and to see him get into the general swim of debate in the House of Representatives. His constituents have every reason to be proud of their Congressman for his maiden speech here today. I am familiar with the Sun-Times recommendation regarding denial of the Panama Canal to ships hauling goods to Communist-dominated Cuba. The gentleman from Illinois is wise in urging the proposal be adopted as part of our policy toward Cuba. This is a sound proposal. I should like to congratulate the gentleman from Illinois on his opening remarks when he said he was not so much concerned about the number of troops or types of weapons in Cuba, but whether or not the very presence of Soviet Communists in Cuba is serving as a base for exporting communism to the entire South American Continent. This is really the heart of the Cuban issue and I hope the gentleman

will agree that this is the concept in which President Kennedy is today viewing the entire Cuban situation. He has stated repeatedly that the presence of Communists in Cuba constitutes a menace to this country and this entire hemisphere in that Cuba serves as a base for exporting communism to the rest of the South American Continent.

I believe that the suggestion made by the gentleman today certainly is one that should be given careful consideration as a step toward an overall effort to narrow the ability of the Communists to fortify Cuba economically so they can continue exporting communism to South America. Once we succeed in isolating Cuba economically, I believe we can start looking confidently toward the day when we can eradicate the Communists from Cuba. It has been my judgment for some time that sooner or later the Communists will fall from the weight of their own oppression—not only in Cuba but all over the world. No system has had as dismal a record of failure as the Communist system. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to congratulate my neighbor to the north of my congressional district, for the significant contribution he has made here today in his maiden speech and certainly, for calling our attention to the excellent editorial which appeared in the Sun-Times. Even though the gentleman and I are of different political parties and beliefs, I am certain I can state with confidence, Mr. RUMSFELD's constituents can be proud of his initial contribution today.

Mr. RUMSFELD. I thank my colleague.

#### ROGERS CHARGES THAT WEATHER NOT THE REASON FOR CIA MISSILE PHOTO LAG

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, weather conditions can hardly be the reason why the CIA, according to reports, was unable to produce photos of Russian missiles in Cuba and the Air Force did. From published reports, it appears that the very first Strategic Air Command overflight of Cuba produced the photographs which showed the extent of Russian missiles in Cuba was sufficient for the President to act.

I have compared the weather reports for Cuba during the period September 5 through October 14—the period during which CIA was allegedly conducting aerial intelligence reconnaissance over Cuba. Cloudy to rainy weather prevailed on the days CIA overflights were reportedly conducted. As confirmed by the Department of Defense, aerial reconnaissance of Cuba was performed by the Air Force during the early morning hours of October 14. This is the important point—weather conditions on that morning were generally as cloudy and difficult as those under which the CIA had been operating for the previous 5 weeks. And as the President stated in his speech on October 22 when he came before the Nation to expose the

Soviet threat in Cuba, his decision was based on receiving the first preliminary hard missile information the morning of October 16.

Just what is the reason?

In any case, the Congress has a right to review the operations of the CIA. Such review should be conducted by Members of both the House and the Senate in a joint watchdog committee as I have proposed. I urge all Members of Congress to get behind the movement to form this permanent joint watchdog committee for the security of this Nation.

#### ELLIS ISLAND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBERSTEIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FARBERSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as Ellis Island is in the 19th Congressional District which I have the honor to represent, I feel a special interest in the problem of its disposition. Let me recall that it has been more than 7 years since the historic old facility was abandoned, 7 years in which the island has been idle and has been allowed to gradually decay.

Now, there is no need to argue at length for the special importance of this piece of property. Ellis Island is not ordinary real estate to be sold to the highest bidder. Yet unless Congress takes action, the General Services Administration will once again throw the island open to competitive bidding and we may indeed see a commercial project replace the historic buildings.

We are fortunate that there are citizens in our community sufficiently alarmed by this prospect to have organized and to have worked for an alternative. A group of our most distinguished educators has, in the past 2 years, elaborated a detailed, concrete, and practical plan that would convert the existing buildings on Ellis Island into a first-rate new liberal arts college. Their plan would accomplish a double goal; it would preserve all the existing buildings and at the same time it would put them to practical use by meeting the urgent and growing need for more educational facilities.

I think we who have been concerned about the disposition of this property owe much to the educators who have taken the trouble to create an imaginative plan for its use. There are virtues to their proposal which seem to me to be superior to any that have been offered in the 7 years since the island's abandonment. I would like to suggest a few.

In the first place, their proposal helps to meet an immediate and pressing need. We are all, I think, growing aware of the problems that face us in the present shortage of college facilities. The next few years will see an acute crisis. With a facility readily adaptable and crying for use, it would be disgraceful not to seize this opportunity.

Second, the new college has the virtue of putting the historic site to a use which I find most appropriate. Ellis Island once stood for opportunity for millions. Formal higher education has never

been so crucial; it has never been so important in opening up opportunity. We cannot handicap our youth by failing to give them the educational chances they need and deserve. But this means we must be alive to every new possibility.

Again, I am much impressed by the public support the proposal has received, so evident in newspaper editorials like the New York Times, the Journal American, the Washington Post, and others. I think it is a most important consideration that the alternative we choose for Ellis Island's future be one that is in the interest of and has the support of the public. We remember the outcry in the past against commercial sale. It was justified. Ellis Island is a monument to a very special and important part of our historical experience. The new college at Ellis Island would preserve the old buildings as a living and fitting memorial to the past.

Because of her special location in the great harbor, thousands of visitors pass Ellis Island daily. Set beside the Statue of Liberty, the symbolic value of the new institution is most important. We must not allow this opportunity to pass. Let us make a farsighted decision. Housing projects, hospitals, and the like are worthy endeavors. But they can be usefully built elsewhere. Let us provide on Ellis Island a new institution that will belong to the Nation, an institution that we will be proud to point to as we pass it in the harbor. Let us preserve the old buildings and put them to appropriate use.

In short, let us back the efforts of the distinguished citizens who want to create a great new liberal arts college on that site. They have worked unselfishly toward that end for a long time. Let us share their vision and help make a new and exciting reality of Ellis Island, one in which we may all partake and one in which we may all take pride.

Toward this end I am today introducing legislation authorizing the Administrator of the General Services Administration to dispose of Ellis Island to the Ellis Island for Higher Education, Inc., of New York for educational purposes.

#### ONE GENERAL EXPENDITURE AUTHORIZATION FOR EACH FISCAL YEAR

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SKUBITZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce a resolution that would provide that the Congress place an annual expenditure limitation on every spending account in the Federal budget. This is a companion resolution to one that was introduced in the Senate on January 24, 1963, by Senator BYRD of Virginia and Senator WILLIAMS of Delaware.

There is nothing new about this resolution. Similar ones have been introduced at each session for at least a dozen

years, and all of them have ended up in the pigeonholes of unfinished business.

It is my sober judgment that this resolution transcends in importance all other business that will come before the 88th Congress. It is not pleasant to think about, but we now stand with our backs against the fiscal wall. It should now be obvious to even a child that if this Nation is to escape national bankruptcy and runaway inflation, it is going to be necessary for the Congress to regain control of expenditures. This administration, like the three that have preceded, has shown no signs that it intends to embrace fiscal sanity. It has been completely taken in by the political heresy of bug-eyed and long-haired university professors who have been bamboozling the young with the Keynesian theory that the more we spend and waste the more prosperous we shall become. This theory has long since landed on the seashore of exploded delusions, and the sooner we abandon it the better.

It is not necessary here to tell any Member of this House that unless we place an annual limitation against all expenditure authorizations, including current appropriations, unexpended balances and countless other loopholes that invite public waste, that chaos is inevitable. You have all been to school and know it as well as I do.

To delay any longer effective expenditure control amounts to no more than ignoring a grave responsibility of Government that should have been discharged a dozen years ago.

#### EQUAL RIGHTS

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the Record a communication which I have received from a member of my constituency, and an outstanding leader in the field of labor, Mr. L. Joseph Overton, vice president, Negro American Labor Council:

FEBRUARY 22, 1963.

Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ADAM: This letter may be a little late coming during a time when you may be under the deepest criticism. I sincerely hope that you realize the position you are in is one which has been and will always be criticized throughout history. You are the chairman of one of the greatest committees in the history of our Nation. The top two domestic issues of our Nation are labor and education. The only persons in this position who would not draw criticism would be the ones not doing anything. And an individual not doing anything, and not drawing criticism would mean the same thing—nothing.

Since those who recognize the importance and significance of the operations of your committee know that your job is one which the world would recognize and feel that in lieu of all criticism, the job which has been done by your committee and under your supervision since you have been chairman

is one to be hailed by our Nation because of your closeness and understanding of the people for which this committee was established in the Halls of Congress some 80 years ago, has again created the same conflict and condemnation for which came about in the Halls of Congress and the Nation in these ancient years.

It is regrettable that after 100 years since the Emancipation Proclamation, you have to suffer today the pressures and condemnations of that era, but, since the committee of which you are chairman did not complete the work on behalf of the people, the job of creating equal opportunities in employment and education for all American people, the job must be done.

I feel for you in the condemnations and criticisms which are now being launched against you. However, I do believe that your decision to remain in Congress and to continue your struggle to place before the American people the way of a true democracy was the right one and by doing so the future would undoubtedly vindicate your action and position in all of these matters which are now being criticized.

With the above thoughts in mind, I would like to express my personal feeling which I believe is shared by many of the black people of America, and certainly by all of those with whom I am and have been associated. We pledge our fullest support and confidence in your efforts to eradicate all injustices in discrimination in the fields of labor and education that may now exist in our Nation.

Sincerely and fraternally yours,  
L. JOSEPH OVERTON.

#### ACCIDENT RATES IN COAL MINES

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in 1962, 289 men were killed in accidents in the U.S. bituminous coal, lignite, and anthracite mines. These fatalities occurred at a frequency rate of 1.20 per million man-hours of exposure, the same as last year which was the second worst year since World War II.

At least 95 percent of all injuries and fatalities in coal mines are preventable and only occur because of the failure of all concerned to apply the knowledge they possess and have not used.

In an analysis of coal mine roof, face, and rib fall fatalities by size of mine and district the Bureau of Mines shows 47 men were killed in title I mines—those employing 14 or less underground—against 66 killed in title II mines—those employing 15 men or more underground. Nearly half such deaths occurred in the so-called small mines in spite of the fact that they produce less than 14 percent of the coal.

Mr. Speaker, I took an active part in the fight to pass Public Law 552 the original Mine Safety Act. At that time I was opposed to the amendment which refused Federal inspectors the power to shut down a mine working less than 15 men underground when an imminent danger was found. I am still opposed to it. I believe that every man who goes down into a hole in the ground is en-



titled to all the protection the operator, the State, and the Federal Government can give him. I think that every State inspector and every Federal inspector should have that power. I know that men seeking a job are not wholly free. They must work for a living.

They cannot remain idle and must accept offered employment even if it means they are taking their lives in their hands when they do so. They must take care of their wives and children and they do even if it means taking a chance in an unventilated, untimbered, gassy and dusty hole in the ground.

I hope and trust that the 88th Congress will undo the wrong done to the mineworkers of America and provide them with the full protection of Public Law 552, the Federal mine safety bill.

**A BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY ACT SO AS TO PROVIDE FURTHER FOR THE PREVENTION OF ACCIDENTS IN COAL MINES**

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 552, Eighty-second Congress, entitled "An Act to amend Public Law 49, Seventy-seventh Congress, so as to provide for the prevention of major disasters in coal mines", approved July 16, 1952, chapter 877, 66 Stat. 692, 30 U.S.C. 471, be amended by striking out section 201(b) thereof.*

**THE SUBCONTRACTOR'S RIGHT TO SUE THE GOVERNMENT**

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, a major reform needed in the Government's procurement process is to accord to subcontractors the right to recover directly from the Government payment due for labor or material furnished to the prime contractor in prosecution of a Government contract. I have introduced H.R. 4390 to accomplish that reform.

A prime contractor may demand from the Government the payment due under his Government contract, and institute a suit in case of nonpayment. However, although the Government is the beneficiary of the services rendered or supplies furnished under the subcontract, there is no procedure by which the claim of the subcontractor can be presented against the United States except as a claim of the prime contractor. The reason is said to be that there is no contract, express or implied, between the subcontractor and the Government.

Presently, the subcontractor may resort to private litigation in a court of law against the prime contractor for payment due under the subcontract, but a small subcontractor can neither afford the high cost of the usually protracted litigation nor the interminable delays involved. Small contractors are, thus, often forced to submit to offers of settlement which are, in many instances, ruinous. Additionally, the fact that a

subcontractor is unable to count on prompt payment by his prime contractor constitutes a definite handicap to the subcontractor and his ability to obtain financing.

This constitutes a clear injustice to the subcontractor and a hardship which, in my opinion, should not be imposed upon him, especially at a time when, due to the increasing complexity and sophistication of military weaponry, it is becoming more and more difficult for small business to obtain a fair share of Government business as prime contractors.

It behooves the Government to deal with the small subcontractor in this matter on the same basis as it deals with the prime contractor, especially since the Government controls subcontracts by requiring the prime contractor to include in the contract certain clauses before it will approve a subcontract. These clauses contain general conditions to the effect that the subcontractor should perform his work in accordance with the provisions of the prime contract, that the Government may inspect, and reject the subcontractor's work, and that the obligations of the subcontractor and prime contractor toward each other should be equivalent to the obligations between the Government and the prime contractor. These clauses grant the Government authority over the subcontractor without assuming corresponding responsibility.

Not only is the Government denying the unpaid subcontractor direct access to the courts for the benefits it is receiving, but it also prohibits its contracting officers to consent to a subcontract containing a clause conferring upon the subcontractor the right to resort to the Government's own administrative procedures—Armed Services Procurement Regulation 3-903.5.

This is an intolerable situation both from the point of view of the small contractor as well as that of the Government. The bill I have introduced will remedy this injustice, in that it will establish privity between the subcontractor and the Government which is now required to enable him to obtain payment for services rendered or supplies furnished to the Government under a subcontract entered into with a prime contractor.

This is a needed amendment and I urge that early action be taken on H.R. 4390 by the Congress.

**YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS MUST BE LARGER**

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, 1963 is a year of decision.

We must decide this year whether we want this Nation to remain strong in the 1970's and the long future, or whether we will slip downward through inaction and neglect of the greatest natural re-

source America possesses—the youth of this Nation.

We all know the familiar figures: 1 million more 16-year-olds this year than last year, as a result of the postwar baby boom; unemployment among youths 2½ times the national average. We are all familiar with the social pattern: rising idleness, frustration, juvenile delinquency, crime—all sapping the national strength.

The principle of the Youth Conservation Corps is the most thrilling development since the establishment of the Peace Corps. It is not the most important bill in Congress. I think education is far and away the most important. But youth employment comes a close second.

We have heard a lot of talk about fiscal responsibility. I think this Nation would be highly irresponsible fiscally if we sat on our hands and failed to act to save what could be a lost generation. The fiscally responsible thing to do is to invest a small amount in a program which will pay rich dividends in a stronger America, as our young people develop a sense of responsibility, new skills, and help enrich the value of our vast resources and learn the great lessons of service to their home communities.

Let me turn the focus for a minute on West Virginia, and illustrate why this program is so badly needed. In West Virginia, we first experienced the shock of losing young people right after the Korean conflict. West Virginia paid a bonus to its Korean war veterans, and 44.3 percent of the bonus checks went to out-of-State addresses—thus indicating that the cream of our young work force was leaving the State in the 1950's because they found superior economic opportunities elsewhere.

What is the situation today? The strength of West Virginia's future rests on the shoulders of our young people between the ages of 16 and 21. These young people will not only supply our future leadership, but they will in large part determine the economic future of West Virginia. I am sure everyone is aware that West Virginia has in a sense become a laboratory to determine whether the American economic system can flourish. A lot of local programs have lifted communities up by the bootstraps. For example, in the city of Logan, the Woman's Club won a nationwide award from the General Federation of Woman's Clubs by reason of communitywide effort to bring in a new industry, to provide new employment and recreation opportunities, to lift the face of this largest coal-producing county in the Nation. In 1963, West Virginia's centennial year, this kind of spirited grassroots activity is going on all over the State. The Area Redevelopment Administration, the accelerated public works program and efforts to channel more Federal contracts into West Virginia have generated an economic upturn. We are starting to move in West Virginia.

Now comes this surge of thousands of young people thrown onto the labor market, and here is the crisis which the Youth Employment Act can and must

meet. There has been a lot of talk about school dropouts. Between 1960 and 1962, the Office of Education reports that nationwide, the rate of high school graduates rose from 68.5 to 69.7 percent. Nationwide, the dropout rate is still too high, but it did decline in the last 2 years. But while the dropout rate was declining in the Nation, it was rising in the State of West Virginia. During the same period, high school graduates in West Virginia declined from 62.1 percent in 1960 to 59.9 percent in 1962. This means that not only is our dropout rate in West Virginia going in the wrong direction, but in 1962 it was almost 10 percent above the national average.

The national dropout percentage for 1962 was 30.2 percent. For West Virginia, it was 40.1 percent.

In the face of these serious developments, we are taking action in West Virginia. In 1962, the State legislature appropriated \$70,000 for a pilot study and experiment in one county—Mercer—in the southern area of the State where there is a high percentage and also a high ratio of school dropouts. The study took 149 school dropouts in Mercer County, and made participation in the program compulsory. An instructional program during the summer months was aimed at preparing the boys for practical jobs. This morning I talked with the State Superintendent of Schools, Rex Smith, about the results of the pilot study. He said that of the 149 enrolled, 114 completed the course. Of the 35 that did not complete the course, some were employed, entered military service, or moved out of the State. Of the 114, 12 returned to school, 9 entered military service, 14 were employed, and 79 were still unemployed at the time the survey was completed last fall.

Superintendent of Schools Smith told me that West Virginia is now applying the experience in this one-county pilot study in other areas of the State. Gov. W. W. Barron reported on Monday of this week that the West Virginia dropout rate is now leveling off, and for the first 3 months of the current school term the rate is considerably lower than the dropout average in recent years. Incidentally, Superintendent of Schools Smith enthusiastically endorsed the principle of the Youth Employment Act and said it would be a step in the right direction.

Recently, the Secretary of Labor reported a very ominous figure: in West Virginia, unemployment of male youths between 16 and 21 in April 1960 was 19.4 percent. The national average in this age bracket is only 10.8 percent.

Unemployment of this age group is two and a half times the national average, as has been pointed out; but in West Virginia, it is nearly four and a half times the national average. Only one State has a higher unemployment rate for young people—Alaska—and, of course, there are special circumstances in Alaska during the winter season, among the Eskimos, and in certain areas of that State.

In the next 4 years, 95,000 to 100,000 young people lacking the benefit of a specialized skill will be entering the la-

bor market in our State, or else migrating to other States because they cannot find work. More positive measures must be taken immediately to provide a reasonable training program for young people in order to help these young people acquire some constructive work experience.

The State of West Virginia has experimented in many programs which have provided some measure of the success of the type of approach used in the Youth Employment Act. The State spent \$50,000 in rehabilitating 95 delinquent boys at a State-operated forestry-conservation camp near Davis, W. Va. In the 2-year period involved these young men accomplished some \$200,000 worth of constructive conservation work. It would have cost more than \$50,000 if these youngsters had been confined or maintained in idleness. Yet the major dividend is the healthful, purposeful outdoor life provided and the skills learned in the rehabilitation process.

One important point here is that voluntary opportunities for this type of healthful outdoor work are not available to those unemployed youths who are not delinquent—or who may be potential delinquents in the near future.

The Youth Employment Act would offer our young people hope for the future and would give them a chance to perform useful activities which would benefit both themselves and their State. The Federal land in West Virginia totals 950,000 acres, and State-owned land 220,000 acres. We have 19 State parks, 9 State forests, and 12 hunting areas. This morning I talked with State director of national resources, Dr. Warden Lane, and he told me:

I would give anything to get some young people working in these areas.

And Dr. Lane added that he could use all we could get for him. Dr. Lane enthusiastically endorsed the principle of the bill.

Title I is a very appealing part of the bill, since we have the tremendously successful experience of the Civilian Conservation Corps to build on. But the amounts are pitifully small. I can see the force of the argument that we should not bring in too many youngsters to exceed accommodations. But 15,000 is barely enough to slow down a few forest fires, let alone carry out some of the more constructive conservation programs. Surely, we cannot expect 15,000 to contribute much toward solving the youth unemployment problem of our Nation. Take West Virginia, for example. Under title I, I am informed that 225 young men might be eligible for our State. You have heard the conditions which confront us; yet a 15,000-man program would mean only 4 boys per county in West Virginia. I cannot understand the timidity which would dictate that kind of total. This is worse than competing for a college scholarship to get a slot in the Youth Conservation Corps, if they figure on those kind of totals. Furthermore, the ultimate limit or ceiling of 60,000 is fantastically low. The CCC was nearly ten times that size at a time when the country's population

was much smaller. Our own Department of National Resources annually employs 300 young men between the ages of 17 and 20 in our State parks. The Federal program would seem very small in comparison to what the State is already doing.

Under title II, the local area youth employment program, the numbers provided for are a little larger, but still too small for the problem. There is another suggestion which I have for title II. In section 206, provision is made for the Federal Government to pay up to 50 percent of the costs. This means additional matching funds which just simply are not available. The States and localities are just about matched to death financially already. Along came the accelerated public works program and we are squeezed some more and some communities could not even put up 25 percent in very depressed areas.

Now I recognize that any larger Federal contribution under title II would result in fewer young people being able to take advantage of the total program, but I think some of the very hard-hit areas should receive a larger percentage of Federal contribution. Perhaps for the first year of the program, the Federal Government could provide the seed money at 100 percent of the contribution to get the program off the ground, and thereafter the type of formula used by the Public Works Acceleration Act could be employed; that is, a sliding scale between 50 and 75 percent on the basis of a formula including unemployment rate and median family income in the area.

If such provisions were not included in title II, I am afraid that those areas and communities in the Nation which need help the most and can least afford to put up the matching funds will end up not fully participating in the program.

To summarize, I believe this is a great program in principle, but it must be bolder in its approach. It must be larger in scope, and should give attention to the serious financial crisis of the areas it is designed to help.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. MORTON (at the request of Mr. HALECK), for March 4, 5, and 6, 1963, on account of official business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PELL, for 10 minutes today.  
Mr. McCULLOCH, for 30 minutes, today.  
Mr. RUMSFELD, for 30 minutes, today.  
Mr. HOLIFIELD, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.  
Mr. ROOSEVELT, for 2 hours, on Wednesday next.  
Mr. ROGERS of Florida, for 10 minutes, today.  
Mr. TAFT (at the request of Mr. BELL), for 5 minutes, on Monday next.  
Mr. FARBSTEIN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 15 minutes, today and to



revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALGER, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday next.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SNYDER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DEROUNIAN.

Mr. CURTIS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GIBBONS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. NATCHER.

Mr. PATTEN.

Mr. MACDONALD.

Mr. TAYLOR.

Mr. UDALL and to include certain tables.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND ON CIVIL RIGHTS DISCUSSION

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who took part in the discussion on civil rights be granted permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 4, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

488. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report on the review of the programing, delivery, and utilization of selected missile system equipment delivered to European countries under the military assistance program; to the Committee on Government Operations.

489. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting the sixth report on property acquisitions of emergency supplies and equipment by the Office of Civil Defense, Department of Defense, for the quarter ending December 31, 1962, pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

490. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 62d quarterly report on export control covering the 4th quarter, 1962, pursuant to the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

491. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of unnecessary planned procurement of generators by the Department

of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

492. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

493. A letter from the president, Boys' Clubs of America, transmitting an audited financial statement of Boys' Clubs of America for the year 1962, pursuant to Public Law 988, 84th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

494. A letter from the Administrative Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report on the extraordinary contractual actions to facilitate the national defense, of the U.S. Coast Guard for the calendar year 1962, pursuant to Public Law 85-804; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

495. A letter from the executive vice president, National Fund for Medical Education, transmitting a report of an audit of the National Fund for Medical Education for the year ended December 31, 1962, pursuant to Public Law 685, 86th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

496. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a report relating to positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 of the general schedule of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, pursuant to Public Law 854, 84th Congress; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

497. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a report relating to refugee operations during the fifth 6-month period ending December 31, 1962, and reporting that refugee operations were conducted in Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, and Lebanon, countries in which the Department of State has determined that refugee situations exist, pursuant to Public Law 87-510; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 4378. A bill to prohibit interstate contributions in connection with congressional primaries and elections and with elections for electors of the President; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 4379. A bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education, including junior colleges and technical institutes, in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 4380. A bill to prevent the use of stop-watches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 4381. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to permit for 1 year, the granting of national service life insurance to certain veterans heretofore eligible for such insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 4382. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to authorize the President, during periods of acute unemployment, to provide that all individuals otherwise eligible may retire with full benefits thereunder at age 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 4383. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 4384. A bill to amend section 9(b) (3) of the National Labor Relations Act in order to permit labor organizations representing guards to be admitted to certain affiliations of labor organizations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 4385. A bill to donate to the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, White Earth Indian Reservation, some submarginal lands of the United States, and to make such lands parts of the reservation involved; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4386. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 4387. A bill to provide that employees whose basic compensation is fixed and adjusted from time to time in accordance with prevailing rates by wage boards or similar administrative authority serving the same purpose, shall be paid on a weekly basis; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 4388. A bill to amend title I and XVI of the Social Security Act to permit a State to establish or designate a separate agency to administer the portion of its State plan relating to medical assistance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 4389. A bill relating to the tariff classification of woven fabrics in chief value of wool and in part of braid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 4390. A bill to amend the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.R. 4391. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 4392. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to authorize the provision of contracting and procurement assistance to business concerns otherwise qualifying therefor, even though they are not independently owned and operated, if they are located in depressed areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 4393. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to prohibit any State or political subdivision from imposing a lien against an individual's property as a condition of aid or assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 4394. A bill to govern the harvesting of Indian timber; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4395. A bill to amend section 3574 of title 39, relating to nightwork compensation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4396. A bill to increase night differential to 15 percent; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4397. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to change the computation of annuity; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4398. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase the survivor annuity from 55 to 75 percent of the principal annuity in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 4399. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 4400. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt certain farm vehicles from the highway use tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIEHLMAN:

H.R. 4401. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to assist small and independent business, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 4402. A bill to establish a land and water conservation fund to assist the States and Federal agencies in meeting present and future outdoor recreation demands and needs of the American people, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4403. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Alaska among those States which are permitted to divide their retirement systems into two parts for purposes of obtaining social security coverage under Federal-State agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SECREST:

H.R. 4404. A bill to authorize waiver of indebtedness growing out of erroneous payments by the Armed Forces to military personnel or their dependents, to bar recovery of these payments if recovery action is not initiated within 6 years of payment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4405. A bill to increase rates of death compensation payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 4406. A bill to make permanent the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, which relate to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal activities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 4407. A bill to amend the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, as amended, with respect to priority of assignments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4408. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of Indiana:

H.R. 4409. A bill to insure the awarding of defense contracts on a basis of merit through requiring a public record of ex parte communications with respect to such contracts, requiring disclosure of the reasons for awarding of such contracts, and establishing a congressional committee to oversee negotiated contracts; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 4410. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 4411. A bill to prohibit the Postmaster General from intentionally issuing defective stamps; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 4412. A bill to provide uniformity in determinations of disability made by departments and agencies of the United States by requiring the use of the standard schedule for rating disabilities prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATMAN (by request):

H.R. 4413. A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.R. 4414. A bill to provide for the establishment of Fort Toulouse as a national historic site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 4415. A bill to improve, strengthen, and accelerate programs for the prevention and abatement of air pollution; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 4416. A bill to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.J. Res. 293. Joint resolution to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by the Flaming Gorge Dam, Utah, and the recreation area contiguous to such lake in the States of Wyoming and Utah, as "O'Mahoney Lake and Recreation Area"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H.J. Res. 294. Joint resolution amending section 201(a) of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.J. Res. 295. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that appropriations shall not exceed revenues of the United States, except in time of war or national emergency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H. Con. Res. 104. Concurrent resolution providing for one general expenditure authorization act for each fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. FINO:

H. Res. 271. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct a study of the fiscal organization and procedures of the Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. Res. 272. Resolution to amend rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WATSON:

H. Res. 273. Resolution to amend rule XVIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives

to require that certain information be contained in committee reports accompanying general appropriation bills; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. LIBONATI: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona: House Memorial No. 1, of the Arizona House of Representatives, adopted February 8, 1963, urging the Congress of the United States to authorize the immediate cessation of printing of all \$1 silver certificates which do not bear the inscription "In God We Trust"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to article V thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 4417. A bill for the relief of Bryan Simpson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4418. A bill for the relief of Louise Knibbs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBERSTEIN:

H.R. 4419. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services Administration to dispose of Ellis Island for educational purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 4420. A bill for the relief of Laura Do Nascimento; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4421. A bill for the relief of Manuel Pires-Mestre; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.R. 4422. A bill to waive the statute of limitations in a certain case; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### Young Citizens in Action

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER**

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 28, 1963

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, this year the week of March 2 through 9 has been set aside as National 4-H

Club Week and once again it is a pleasure to salute these clubs which are dedicated to the development of multiple programs serving many varying needs. The 4-H Club work does indeed belong to the people and rightfully inspires a reaffirmation of our faith in our country when we realize the vital part such organizations play in preparing our youth of today for their mature responsibilities of tomorrow.

The phenomenal growth of the system of 4-H Clubs, initiated in the early years

of this century, is due to a dynamic program of education functioning through our State land-grant colleges and universities in cooperation with the Federal Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture. In addition to this leadership at the national level, the State extension services provide helpful direction as do the more than 307,750 unpaid volunteer local leaders who are assisted by about 114,960 older club boys and girls designated as junior leaders. Working together also for the betterment of the